



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

THE BIBLE
AND
THE PEOPLE,

FOR
1851.



A GROWING MANUAL OF PRINCIPLES AND INVESTIGATION, FOR
DOUBTERS, ENQUIRERS, AND INTELLIGENT BELIEVERS.

VOL. I.

LONDON:
WARD AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCLI.

Per. 1419. e. 324

LONDON:
BORWICK AND PRIESTLEY, PRINTERS, LONDON WALL.

P R E F A C E.

It was not without much fear, and a deep sense of responsibility that **THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE** was commenced: and this responsibility was of a two-fold nature: first and foremost, that the pens employed in this periodical, should afford instructive, useful, and quickening materials for the minds of its readers; and be of some new service to the cause of enlightened Christianity: secondly, to ensure such an extent of circulation as should secure at least, from pecuniary loss, one who was too generous to seek gain, being willing to do good for its own sake.

Having no organ of the public press immediately allied to our undertaking, and therefore engaged directly or indirectly, to further our purpose, we were dependent solely upon the nature of our efforts, and such slight publicity as we were able to secure.

Our thanks are due both to many of our readers who took an active interest in extending the periodical, from an appreciation of its value: and also to many organs of the weekly press, for their disinterested and generous recognition.

We can only desire the continuance of the attentions of both; promising, on our parts, to aim at being more worthy of their aid and commendations; our sole desire is to remove ignorance, to extend a true knowledge of the gospel and its claims: we ask only a candid examination of the spirit and purpose of **THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE**, charitable forbearance towards any imperfections, which experience may diminish; together with the strenuous efforts of such as can cordially unite with us in extending the sphere of our influence and usefulness.

With these views and hopes, we may address our readers in the words of a circular letter already sent to a few, and request from any, such suggestions and communications as they may be prompted to forward to us.

“As a friend of a vigorous and healthy Christian literature, your attention is respectfully requested to the Prospectus of **THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE**, for 1852.

Too great a proportion of the reading presented to the public; is simply of the nature of amusement or pastime; which undermines the power of thought by easy common-place: hence we require periodicals that will strengthen the understanding, and fortify the character.

The danger of this active age, is that we may destroy the power of thought, by the distraction of pressing engagements; the little leisure being filled up with *easy reading*—the bane of all earnestness and principle!

Thus is the understanding enervated, and the mind becomes a creature of accident, as to the truths or errors it imbibes. Such is especially the danger of those who have (as is said) **NO TIME FOR READING**, or who have **TOO MANY books and periodicals**: for these **THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE** is peculiarly adapted. Because it presents in a readable space, a condensation of those truths and principles with which it is important for all persons to be acquainted.

Its purpose is to exhibit in short plain articles, the saving truths of Christianity, their application to private and public life, and especially *to expose the sophistry of the infidel, rationalistic and superstitious publications.*

THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE stands *alone* in the peculiarity of its purpose, and in adaptation to the wants of an *enquiring* age; in which too many think that change is progress, whilst some regard custom as infallibility.

Whilst suitable to all who are careful to examine and embrace the

truth, this periodical will be found especially fitted for the *heads of families*, both as useful to themselves, and a *repository of instruction* for those growing up under their care.

It is adapted to *young men* of enquiring minds ; it claims the attention of *employers*, as suitable to be by them introduced to the notice of their *workmen*.

It will be found serviceable to ministers of religion, and a great help to those engaged in Town Missions, and Lay preachers generally ; as well as to those occupied in Sabbath School Teaching.

May we beg your interest and influence in introducing it to the notice of any such persons, as well as Mechanics' Institutes, and the working classes generally, so far as you have opportunity ?

Your kind co-operation in taking the periodical yourself, and making it known in the circle of your acquaintance, will be esteemed a great favour, and we earnestly believe, will be doing great good."

With fear and trembling, but with earnest hope, and devout prayer to the source of all blessing and illumination, we send forth this first volume, and look forward to our future efforts.

The following publications, to which your attention is also requested, will serve to indicate the nature of some of the principles advocated in **THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE**.

The Three Shams. 1s.

Four Orations to the Oratorians ; a Reply to Dr. Newman. 2d each. Bound 1s.

The Swallowell Family ; a concise exposure of Wilberforce's reasons for his Romanism. 1½d. Suitable for general distribution.

Rimini and Oxford, the Winking Virgin, and the Puseyite Divinity. 6d.

The above, together with **THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE**, are all Published by Ward and Co., London : and may be had of all Booksellers.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Christianity a Reasonable Religion	1
The Keys of the Kingdom ; what they are and who stole them	9
The Parable of St. Martin's Spire	19
Free Thoughts for Free Thinkers	30
The Provinces of Science, Philosophy, and Religion	41
The Inscription on the Cross ; its three Languages and their Lessons	49
Peter's Keys and the Pope's Picklocks ; or Binding and Loosing	60
The House of Merchandize	73
The Atheists' Box ; or the Argument from Design... .. .	85
Mind and Matter : their Evidences and Distinctions	92, 283, 423, 457
Reason not Rationalism ; or true Methods of interpreting the Scriptures	97
Prelacy Based on Forgery	110
Church Polity	117
Infidels' Candour and knowledge of the Scriptures	125
Poetic Diction ; its Use and Abuse in Oratory	129
The Bible our True Magna Charta	145
Rome's Logic, scheme the first	154
The Ecclesiastical Marriage Bill	163
Infidel Tactics	175
The Nature of Faith and Science	181
The Utility of Philosophy	186
The Permanent Test of Religious Truth in the Written Word of God	193
Korah, Dathan, and Abiram	207
Mene Mene Tekel Upharsin	212
Passages from the Life of an Inquirer	223, 271, 321, 408
The Mystic Emerson	226
The Nature of Faith	236
The Gathering of the Nations	241
The Converts to Rome, where Educated ? an appeal to Churchmen	246
Church Extension	263

CONTENTS.

vii.

Page.

The Basis of Human Brotherhood in the Bible Doctrine of "One God and Father of All"	289
The Reformation Reformed	297
The Theory of Intolerance involved in Words and Names applied to Religious Parties and Doctrines	307, 359
Autobiography of an Atheist	327, 372, 404
The True Apostles' Creed; or the New Testament Canon of Life and Doctrine, in the Person of Jesus Christ	337, 385, 433, 529
The Rev. George Swallowell and his Family Connexions; [or, Reasons for Submitting to the Church of Rome.]	345
Roman Oratory, and Protestant Logic	396
The Evidence of Testimony, and its Special Application to the Truth of Christianity	418
St. Philip Neri, Founder of the Oratorians: "his Maxims and Sayings." ..	439
The Rev. I. E. N. Molesworth, D.D., and his Wesleyan Convert ..	449
The Rev. Robert Nares, A.M., on the Character of Christ	453
The Vision	460
Labour and Capital, or Men and Masters; their Rights and Duties	464
The Mesmeric Mania of 1851.. .. .	476
The First Sham, the Sham Peter, called the Pope	481
The Second Sham, the Sham Church, called the Infallible	495
The Third Sham, the Sham Bible, the Douay and Unwritten Bible, called Tradition	506
Novels: Are they Beneficial or Injurious to Society?	522
The Ephesian Diana, and the Modern Shrine Makers	545
Mazzini and Italy	554
The Dispatch of Cant	560
The Great Contest; the Bible against Tyranny	567

REVIEWS AND CRITICISMS.

Andrews, Rev. F. The Exhibition	240
Anti-State-Church Association Tracts	287
Beard, Rev. I. K., D.D. The Bible described, &c.	240
Beecher, Rev. H. W. Lectures to Young Men	287
Bentley, Joseph. Health Made Easy	190
Brown, Rev. J. B. First Principles.. .. .	192
Burns, Rev. J., D.D. Discourses on the various forms of Religion	575
Campbell, Rev. J., D.D. Popery and Puseyism Illustrated, &c.	384
Chapman, Rev. W. Manual of Faith and Practice'	240

	Page.
Corner, Miss. The History of Greece	192
Dissenter, a Confirmed. Confirmation neither reasonable nor Scriptural ..	383
Ellis, Rev. W. Lectures on Popery	240
Emancipator. Letter to Catholics	192
Emery, Thomas. Educational Economy, &c... ..	336
Farrar, W. LL.D. Tholuck's Discourses, &c. .. .	383
Grant, Brewin. Rimini and Oxford	48
Hargreaves. Providence	192
Harrison, J. The Logic of Life, &c.	96
Hogan, W. Auricular Confession and Nunneries	384
Holyoake, G. J. The Last Trial for Atheism	288
Hood, Edwin Paxton. The Age and its Architects	432
Kendall, Rev. James. Punctuality	335
Legge, Rev. George, LL.D. Christianity in harmony with man's nature, present and progressive	47
Lewitt, Rev. J. Essay on Sabbath School Teachers, &c.	288
Miller Rev. Edward. Scripture subjects put into simple verse for the young ..	383
Moral Reformer	336
More, Rev. Henry. Protestant Priestism	96
Norwich Operative. Political Monopoly, Hostile to Christianity	96
Pearsall, Rev. J. S. Faith and Order, &c.	383
Plain Man. Church of Christ	192
Poulter, Rev. J. Course of Lectures on Puseyism	575
Reed, Rev., D.D. The Hymn Book	576
Rees, Rev. W. Providence and Prophecy, &c.	384
Rogers, Rev. J. G. Christianity and its Evidences	288
Sergeant, A.M. Easy Lessons in Geography	192
Short, Rev. R. S. The Cross and the Crucifix	382
Swan, Rev. Thomas. Lectures on the Attributes of the Divine Being ..	528
[N.B. This useful work, was erroneously described as published by Green, instead of Houlston and Stoneman.]	
Thomas, Rev. D. Core of Creeds, &c.	240
Thwaites, W. Not the Church, not the Pope, but the Bible	192
White, Rev. V. M. Popish Intolerance, &c.	382
Williams, S. The Fear of Death	96
———— The Creed of Error	96

I.

CHRIST'S RELIGION.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD." 1 Thess. v. 21.

CHRISTIANITY A REASONABLE RELIGION.

THE above general title—"Christ's Religion,"—is adopted in this first department of our enquiries to remind the doubting, and caution the believer, that there is much in the world passing under the name of Christianity, which is not sanctioned by the New Testament. We have therefore nothing to do with objections and difficulties arising out of human schemes or impositions; since on these pretensions our hopes do not rest; and in reference to them, we also are sceptical.

It is to be feared that much infidelity has originated in a revolt against superstition; that men disgusted with the worldliness and pompous ritual of a pretended Christianity, have been betrayed into hostility against that religion which they have known only in name. We have, consequently, distinguished between Christ's religion, and the religion of a priesthood;—wolves in sheeps' clothing: and whereas, in the dishonoured name of Christianity, many deeds of oppression have been committed, it is necessary further to indicate, that the gospel is not to be confounded with a combination of Priestcraft and Statecraft.

Whatever persons object to, as condemning the religion of the New Testament, they are bound in logic and morals, to find in those writings: and if on the contrary, all such things are forbidden and repudiated in the code of Christian laws, the opposition on this ground is plainly misdirected. It will be found on a fair examination, that the religion of Jesus Christ, is consistent with, nay, the firmest support of all human rights and duties.

This we hope (in our subsequent enquiries) to make plain to every understanding. If however it should be objected, that no one knows what Christianity is, since there are so many opinions on the subject; it is a sufficient reply for the present, that (besides the substantial agreement amongst the majority of sects) real Christianity may be discovered in the Bible, with as great certainty as we can interpret or understand any book in the world, which contains a statement of opinions.

The whole of Christianity may be well understood with less reading and argument than have of late been wasted in ascertaining the purpose of one article in the Church Catechism—baptismal regeneration. It is when we turn aside to human inventions, that we get bewildered: the clergy may be lost in the Arches Court, the Privy Council, the Courts of

Common Pleas, Queen's Bench and Exchequer; but a plain man with a conscience, needs only to take his Bible into the Court of Common Sense.

And in this appears another point of freedom cherished by Christianity, namely FREEDOM OF THOUGHT; without which there can be no other freedom, and with which there must be all other.

The gospel does not demand a blind assent, but intelligent faith; it is the priest who requires the people to open their mouth and shut their eyes to see what he may send:—to wink and swallow the wafer.

It is the present priests of Rome who have invented the appropriate miracle of a winking picture, that attention may be turned from the despotism of State and Church: that if the picture winks with one eye, the people may wink with both: or shut their eyes altogether.

But Christ's religion comes "to open men's eyes, to turn them from darkness to light:" we are commanded there to "*prove* all things, and hold fast that which is good:" which means that we are to throw away what is bad; and in discriminating thus, we exercise our own reason and conscience, by the aid of the best light afforded to us. It is consequently a great mistake to suppose that the FAITH Christianity requires, is something opposed to reason: "faith," in the Scriptures, is only another term for the exercise of reason, in opposition to the blind indulgence of sense and passion—"the deceitful lusts, which war against the soul." We speak here of faith (and Christianity in general) in its relation to the *intellect*; as excluding for the present, those spiritual or moral consequences arising out of faith or enlightened conviction.

Christianity appeals to our reason, and by this means requires and cultivates our spiritual freedom: those who are versed in its principles have their "senses exercised to discern between good and evil"—not the bodily senses, of eyes and ears; nor the passions of our nature, but our mental perceptions or *reason*; which, when opposed to bodily senses, is called "*faith*." To believe, is to have "the eyes of our understanding enlightened;" and because this religion deals with spiritual things, not with the objects of our bodily senses or passions, it enforces the moral habit of following reason alone—as "we walk by faith, and not by sight." This is the true and only opposition, between faith and sense;—it does not say, "we walk by faith not by reason:" but we follow our better judgment and improved insight, not our earthly impulses.

Dr. Arnold very clearly maintained this view of faith, as expressed in the following sentence—

"It is *not scriptural but fanatical*, to oppose faith to reason; faith is properly opposed to sense: it is listening to the dictates of the higher part of our minds, to which God speaks, rather than to the lower part of us, to which the world speaks. . . . This cuts down at once, all Pusey's nonsense about rationalism;—what he abuses as rationalism, is what the Scriptures commend, as knowledge, judgment, understanding and the like."—*Life and Correspondence of Dr. Arnold*. Vol. ii. p. 64.

Accordingly the Apostle Paul aimed to commend himself "by manifestation of the truth to every man's conscience," that men might follow those principles which the mind can appreciate, instead of the indulgencies which appeal to the "lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life:" the "victory which overcometh these is our faith," or

mental conviction of something nobler. Faith is equally opposed to superstition; since it rests on the understanding of truth, whilst superstition must have something to please the sight: religion addresses the conscience and reason, superstition addresses the senses: accordingly when men lost faith, or clear conviction of an invisible God, they made a sensible image like to corruptible man, and birds, and four-footed beasts and creeping things.—(Romans i.)

In like manner, when men forget to regard mentally the truths of Christianity, they have pictures and relics: this is superstition or sight, in opposition to understanding and principle, which say—"whom having not seen, we love." So that faith is opposed to passion, sense, and superstition; in other words, it is enlightened reason. It looks at the things which are not seen by the bodily eye; but which are appreciated by the eye of faith, or understanding. That such is its meaning, may further be made obvious by the following instance, in which the Redeemer employs *faith and understanding in reference to the very same thing*: thus proving that the terms mean the same. "Then said Jesus unto them, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. And they reasoned among themselves, saying, it is because we have taken no bread. Which when Jesus perceived, he said unto them, O ye of LITTLE FAITH;—do ye not yet UNDERSTAND?—How is it that ye do not UNDERSTAND that I spake it not to you concerning bread. Then UNDERSTOOD they how he bade them beware of the *doctrine* of the Pharisees and Scribes."—(Matt. xvi. 6—12.)

By "faith" then, our Lord meant perception, insight or understanding of his spiritual meaning. Their little faith, was little understanding:—slowness of heart or judgment to perceive the truth: hence, in another place we read, "*fools* and slow of heart to believe," (Luke xxiv. 25.) wherein our Lord reproaches the dulness of his disciples, in not seeing into the meaning and application of prophecy. "Then opened he their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures," in other words, that he might increase their faith. When Peter was sinking, Jesus "stretched forth his hand and said, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?"—(Matt. 14, 31.) How is it *thou understandest not who I am*; and that, therefore, there is no reason to fear?

This view of faith, as intelligent insight or perception of the truth is incidentally illustrated if not confirmed, by no less a master in Israel than William Tyndale, one of the early English reformers; who speaking of that passage, John xvi. 9.—The Comforter shall convict the world "of sin because they believe not on me,"—observes "he shall rebuke the world for lack of true judgment, and discretion to judge." And this writer proceeds on this principle to advocate the duty of seeing into the grounds and nature of spiritual religion, as the only defence against the bondage of forms, and the blindness of overlooking the real claims of the Saviour. "Wherefore beloved reader, inasmuch as the Holy Ghost rebuketh the world for lack of judgment; and inasmuch also as *their* ignorance is without excuse before whose faces enough is set to judge by, *if they would open their eyes to see*, and not captivate their understanding to believe lies: and inasmuch as the spiritual judgeth all things—wherefore it is time to awake and see every man with his own eyes." But a

greater authority thus condemns the Jews—"their eyes they have closed ; lest they should see with their eyes, and understand, and be converted."—(Matt. xiii. 15.)

Whenever persons misunderstood the emblems of this great teacher, and took them for a reality,—as the woman of Samaria respecting the water he should give ;—(John iv. 15.) the disciples respecting the meat he had which they knew not of—(John iv. 32.) respecting the leaven of the Pharisees—(Matt. xvi. 6.) the Jews, respecting the giving of his flesh to eat—(John vi. 52.) whenever such mistakes occurred, there was little faith ; that is, little understanding. So now, when priests give his flesh to eat, and say we must have it in their wafer or bread ; or when they would have us born again of water at the font ; IT IS NOT FAITH, BUT STUPIDITY THEY REQUIRE. They wish us to enact over again, the littleness of faith, or want of insight which the Saviour condemned.

Faith then, in the gospel, means reason or understanding ; it is a name for wisdom, or *the exercise of wisdom* ; but the Church, *i. e.* priests, have degraded faith into folly, that we may be foolish enough to have faith in them : which would indeed be the height of folly.

Let it therefore be stored up as a maxim of the highest consequence, that Christian faith is enlightened conviction ; that to believe, is to see into and recognise a truth : whilst that spurious faith advocated as the buttress of superstition, is the blind leading the blind—into a ditch.

To believe in Jesus Christ, is to understand what he is and what he came for, and to accept him in that capacity.

We must ourselves judge and appreciate what he says, that we may understand the forcibleness of right words, and learn the meaning of that saying,—“HE SPAKE AS ONE HAVING AUTHORITY, and not as the scribes.”

He was no timid second-hand teacher, appealing to this and that Rabbi ; the only earthly Rabbi he appealed to, was man's conscience ; and the authority he spoke with, was not the dictation of one aspiring to lord it over his fellows ; but the authority of self-witnessing truths, that were therefore authoritative because they awakened, and commended themselves to, man's deepest thoughts and loftiest desires.

His authority, was not the imposition of a tyrant, but the persuasiveness of truth, WHICH OF HIS MAXIMS WILL ANY ONE IMPUGN ? He spake of what he knew : of the divine nature, as he knew *that* ; of human nature, as he knew what was in man.

But he recognized human reason as the point of appeal ;—“why even of yourselves, judge ye not what is right ?” (Luke xii. 57.)

That he could rightly exercise mastery, is not what we here assert, least of all, what we deny : at present we consider only the relation he did assume—persuasion, not force.

Indeed, this is true of all the proceedings of the Divine Being in his moral government ; he rules by *moral means* : that is, by motives, reasons, or persuasion : force is employed when probation is ended : and *that* force is not to secure obedience, but to punish disobedience. God's service, is a *reasonable* one ; and whether we interpret this, as a *service in reason due, or by reason rendered*, the argument or principle is the same ; since either way, it has to do with conviction, insight or faith.

Consistently with this, Christianity comes to enlighten; to rule by teaching; practically, this religion has two elements, faith on our part;— authority on the part of the object, founder, or foundation of Christianity. But this faith in us, is not blindness; and authority in Him is not impiousness: **OUR FAITH IS OUR REASON, AND HIS AUTHORITY IS REASONABLENESS.** We are to believe him because he is the truth. As we have long ago expressed it—“Christianity requires us to believe what is reasonable, to love what is lovely, and to do what is right: and the reasonableness, the loveliness and rectitude, are the grounds of our obligation; as well as the appropriate motives for compliance.” In other words, it therefore speaks with authority, because it is just and true. That this as exhibited in the Saviour, is **THE ONLY AUTHORITY**, as opposed to man’s usurpation, belongs to our second department.

From these observations it is plain, that we are not acting contrary to the spirit of this religion, when by the strictest methods of reasoning we enquire into its grounds and nature.

Some indeed (to save their own systems it may be) join with the sceptic in denying the reasonableness of Christianity, by an outcry against what they call **CARNAL REASON.** But it will presently appear, that this phrase is as little understood, as the terms faith and authority.

There are three gradations of character enumerated in the Epistles:— the natural man, the carnal man, and the spiritual man.

Without here entering into those peculiarities of doctrine founded on these distinctions, we shall give the certain and obvious differences intended by these terms; *so far as they relate to the human intellect*: the moral dispositions or *character* involved in or resulting from them, we leave out of the present enquiry.

These terms may be understood by a slight examination of the first three chapters in the first Epistle to the Corinthians. The primary object of which is to shew the futility of philosophy apart from revelation, in reference to the divine will. That men of themselves, could not attain to a knowledge of God: and hence those agents were employed, who were not indebted to merely natural means; “not the wise” or philosophers; but those learned in another school. All Christian philosophy is summed up in Christ, “who of God is made unto us wisdom.” Therefore, the apostle came “not with enticing words of man’s wisdom;” but “in the demonstration of the spirit and with power,” in divine teaching supernaturally imparted. Comparing human attainments with this wisdom of God, he enquires, “where is the wise, where is the Scribe, where is the disputer of this world?” its wisdom is made or manifested to be foolishness; being eclipsed by the appearance of the true luminary.

All these abortive efforts, were the work of natural or unaided reason: which has always failed on religious questions: “the world by (its own) wisdom knew not God;” he must declare himself: “as it is written, eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.” The provisions of mercy in the gospel were mysteries, or divine secrets, which the princes and philosophers of this world knew not: “but God hath revealed them to us by his spirit:” nor were there any other means of learning, since as a man knoweth not the secrets of his fellow men, so “the things of God knoweth no one but the spirit of God.”

Therefore religious knowledge is unattainable by nature; "the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God;" they are received only by the spiritual man, that is, man under divine guidance.

Considered intellectually then, *he* is the natural man, who has no other learning than human wisdom; whilst the spiritual man is he who is guided by the instructions of God's spirit, whether as direct inspiration to the Apostles or as their record of the spirit's teaching.

The carnal man is between these two: a mixture of the two characters; he degrades spiritual truth from God, by the introduction of human elements. "I could not speak unto you as spiritual," as those who have fully estimated the nature of the gospel; "but as unto *carnal*, even as *babes* in Christ,"—"For while one saith I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal," "ye walk as men" or after men as your pattern; establishing human theories, creeds, rites, or standards.

THIS THEN IS CARNAL REASON, namely, to settle down into any human forms, doctrines or authorities, and oppose the spiritual-mindedness that would search the Scriptures and test all things by the mind of God contained in his word, and to be examined by human reason.

The Bereans were more noble than those of Thessalonica, in that they searched the Scriptures daily, to see whether these things were so.—(Acts xvii. 11.) A spirit of enquiry and examination then, instead of being opposed is required and commended by Christianity: it is by "the word of Christ dwelling in us richly," that we are "filled with the knowledge of all wisdom and *spiritual understanding*."

To oppose this by any efforts or epithets, is pride and carnality;—the addition of a human bondage. Wherefore "let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his *carnal* mind; and not holding the head Jesus Christ," but seeking to rule "after the commandments of men." (Coloss. ii. 18, 19.)

This carnal mindedness is the same thing as littleness of faith, or stupidity and misapprehension, in taking external forms for spiritual realities; laying stress upon what (if not a metaphor metamorphosed into an actual verity,) is at least only extrinsic, accidental, or superadded to the Christian system.

It is not tenderness and reverence for God's truth, that leads men to decry reason in religion, (for that truth is both reasonable in itself and demands the strictest investigation) but it is tenderness for forms, systems and human authorities; it is a want of faith or insight into the nature of the gospel, and adopting the carnal cry of babes, "I am for Paul, or I am for Apollos."

The natural man intellectually considered, walks in the sparks that he or others have kindled, his philosophy is independent of the Bible; the spiritual man is guided by the Bible only; the carnal man, improves upon the Bible: the first is human philosophy, the second divine philosophy, the third an absurd and superstitious, spoiling of both, by the compromise of an unnatural alliance.

They therefore who investigate the Scriptures, earnest to discover their truth and meaning, are not exposed justly to the charge of relying on carnal reason; on the contrary, they seek after divine reason,—whether God the Lord hath spoken, and what he intends to teach: and as *they*

want faith themselves, and seek to destroy faith in others, who require a blindfold submission to priestly conjurings; so *they* are carnally-minded, who wishing us to rest in the dogmas of men, discourage enquiry into the word of God.

From whatever point of view then Christianity be considered, it is plainly offered to the world, as a reasonable religion in itself, and consequently cherishing and requiring the strictest investigation: the faith it demands, is not blindness but insight; the authority it exhibits is not tyranny but reason; its force is evidence; and the carnal reason it condemns is not the exercise of reason upon the Bible, but the addition of fancies and human authority to the Bible: the natural reason it sets aside is not the aim to understand, but an abortive attempt to do without the Bible—to make a Jacob's ladder out of the cobwebs of the brain: the spiritually-minded (intellectually regarded) are not those who shut their eyes, but those who employ them to read and understand—"what the spirit saith unto the churches." "And when he had called the people unto him, HE said, hearken unto *me* EVERY ONE of you, AND UNDERSTAND."—(Mark vii. 14.)

The inherent truthfulness of Christ's religion being thus recognized, we learn that to teach it, is to prove it: for indeed nothing else can prove Christianity but itself; miracles and historical evidences may be useful auxiliaries or introductions; but like the men of Samaria, we must hear for ourselves; and when we find his words measuring the capacities and desires of our entire nature—filling up all the vacancies of the human soul; then we feel the moral demonstration, and acknowledge that "he speaks as one having authority."

This method of proof, namely considering what Christianity really is; whether there be anything in the system repugnant or agreeable to the loftiest reason; in a word, whether it deserve our reception;—is of peculiar value and importance. First, it is important because in general and especially at present, the rejecter of the gospel deals more with the system itself (or what he mistakes as such) than with any historical questions: therefore concluding that it is not worth enquiring about, he will not be very extensive or accurate in historical investigation. This is our first reason for *trying the gospel on its own merits*.

And secondly, this is plainly the test to which Christianity itself appeals; as we have now endeavoured to prove; whilst to believe on any other ground alone, would not be honouring or receiving Christianity, so much as foreign recommendations.

Whilst thirdly, this method is peculiarly suited to the masses of men, who having little learning or leisure, cannot travel over centuries; but require a plain tale that speaks for itself. It is to these that the gospel especially appeals, and therefore it is so constructed as to require no large apparatus of learning: we have not to travel back eighteen hundred years; nor to fetch Christ up from the dead, or down from heaven; but "it is nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, even the word of faith which we preach"—the Bible which all may possess; and whose principles need but be examined to commend the truth to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

It is this method of examination that we shall chiefly adopt in the first

department of our labours; not to the entire exclusion of such historical evidence as may remove difficulties or elucidate truth; but mainly exhibiting the moral evidence which arises out of the nature of Christianity itself: that every one with a Bible, may judge whether this religion really contain those elements which commend themselves to the convictions of plain honest men.

Nor do we aim here exclusively at the conviction of the unbelieving, but also at the instruction of believers; to stir up their pure minds by way of remembrance; and by a fresh view of the gospel to invigorate their faith, as not founded on cunningly devised fables, but on the solid groundwork of truth. Gibbon, the historian, states in his Journal—"I finished the 14th vol. of the *Bibliothèque Raisonnée*. It contains Foster's Sermons. Wonderful! a divine preferring reason to faith." It *was* wonderful; for they are the same thing as one another.

Mr. Locke, no mean judge either of reason or religion, expresses the same sentiments in his "Essay on human understanding." Book iv. chap. 16, at the end, he observes,—“of FAITH and the precedence it ought to have before other arguments of persuasion, I shall speak more hereafter, where I treat of it, as it *is ordinarily placed*, in contradistinction to reason; though in truth it *be nothing else but an* ASSENT FOUNDED ON THE HIGHEST REASON.” And in the eighteenth chapter of the same book, when he treats of the supposed separate province of reason and faith, he distinguishes between them as the natural and supernatural sources of truth; from ordinary reason, and from divine revelation. But in the latter case, we are to employ reason, first to discover what is revelation; and secondly, to interpret its meaning.

“For to this crying up of *faith in opposition to reason* (he concludes) we may I think in good measure ascribe those absurdities that fill almost all the religions which possess and divide mankind.” Hence men have been “led into so strange opinions and extravagant practices in religion”—“that in effect, RELIGION *which should most distinguish us from beasts*, and ought MOST PECULIARLY TO ELEVATE US AS RATIONAL CREATURES, above brutes, is that wherein men often appear most irrational.” We have need then to vindicate the gospel from all supposed or assumed opposition to reason; as being so far from the ally of superstition, that it is the truth (which is reasonable) and will therefore “make us free” from the bondage of imbecility and doting delusions.

Having thus far shewn that Christianity is a reasonable religion; that the faith it requires is understanding and recognising its truths; that the authority it assumes is the force of moral demonstration; that it presupposes, appeals to, and exercises our rational faculties; that it does not condemn as natural reason the attempt to investigate its nature, but the futile attempts to do without it, or the more insolent plan of passing it by; that it condemns as carnal reason, the attempt to shackle enquiry by the stereotyped inventions of men; and that it commends as spiritual the true insight into its doctrines and spirit;—we are prepared for further investigation of the nature or claims of this divine message to mankind.

II.

PRIESTS' RELIGION.

HUMAN AUTHORITY AND INVENTIONS *versus* CONSCIENCE AND THE BIBLE.

The Scriptures are the only standard of Christian faith and practice: every one is at liberty to examine them; but no one is at liberty to decline this examination: and though we may receive the help of others, we may not rest on their authority, (which is man-worship;) nor receive as religion, what is not in the Scriptures, (which is will-worship.)

THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM, WHAT THEY ARE, AND WHO STOLE THEM.

There are three things which may reasonably be asked respecting the Bible,—is it true? what does it mean? to whom does it belong?

For if as some assert, it belongs to the Church, (a mistaken name either in great wickedness or great ignorance bestowed on or assumed by the priesthood;)—if it belong to the priesthood or Clergy, and their word is the evidence of its truth and meaning, religion (in this case) is a belief in men, not in God or his word. All investigation is at an end; we must shut our eyes and seek some one to lead us by the hand.

But since the priesthood cannot bear witness to itself, except in a partial court, we require some evidence arising out of the Scriptures themselves, as to the parties they belong to.

This evidence we are sometimes favoured with, as the priesthood point to the keys and then proceed to lock up our consciences. It is therefore necessary to enquire,—what are the keys, and to whom do they belong?

Our Lord said unto Peter, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven."—(Matt. xvi. 19.) Undoubtedly this was a figurative expression: but its proper meaning may easily be discovered.

The great purpose of metaphors is for illustration or plainness; new truths or relations being rendered clear by comparison with familiar objects. Everybody knows what a key is; and none would find any difficulty in these words, till interested and designing men had turned a metaphor into a mystery, and a mystery into merchandize. This is not the only plain illustration misused by priests for their own selfish purposes of gain or aggrandizement.

The bread of life, essential to salvation, mentioned in John vi. 47—56. is employed for the same ends.

Our Lord there uttered a plain truth, illustrated by our bodily wants, and usual support: but a spurious article has been substituted; the reality being made away with:—transmuted by transubstantiation into a sacrament, with which it had no connexion. And this bread of deceit is manufactured by the magical or black arts of a false priesthood. “How can this man give his flesh to eat?” enquired the carnal-minded Jews; and this is now carnally answered by a corrupt Church;—we can perform this miracle; see this bread, “*hoc est corpus meum*,”* a sacramental miracle, which has appropriately given rise to the equally charming text of the conjuror, “*hocus pocus*.”

This bread of which a man must eat to have spiritual life, was not sacramental bread; for the Lord’s supper was not then instituted; but deceivers have first transformed *this* bread into a sacrament: and secondly transubstantiated the sacramental elements into the body and blood of Christ. But to make their power and gain more enlarged and secure, they turned this merchandize into a monopoly, and say that *only they* can provide this bread; none can eat of the body of Christ, but from the hands of the only true Church: which the Romanists say is themselves, their wafer is our life!

And the Apostolical Successionists in the Church of England, assume the same miraculous monopoly; saying that only a true branch of the Church Catholic, can accomplish this work. And they seriously, if not knavishly, with an affected kindness, warn dissenters that it is a very grave question, whether they ever really partake of the body of Christ, from unauthorized teachers.

Now whilst they say we have not the body of Christ, we know that they have not his Spirit.

Thus a plain metaphor, which taught that as bread is to our bodies, as manna to the Israelites, so Christ and his words are to the soul—is turned into a source of spiritual miracle, monopoly and gain. Thus the Church is a den of thieves, and the sacraments become the delusive wares of this priestly market.

This same is true of baptism and its perversions; but these delusions we shall expose more fully, when treating of *the true* number and *nature* of the sacraments.

The same misapprehension has arisen respecting the simple matter of the keys; which properly handled, would have unlocked all these doubts; and given possession and security to enquirers. Whereas, these keys on the contrary, have been employed, to lock up men’s consciences, to open men’s pockets, and fill the coffers of the Church. We shall enquire

I. WHAT THESE KEYS ARE.

II. TO WHOM THEY BELONG.

III. WHAT USE IS TO BE MADE OF THEM.

I. *What these keys are.*

Plainly it was no real bunch of keys given to Peter; but something that should answer the same end as a key: namely a means of getting into some place, and retaining possession: by locking all thieves out.

A key is to open and fasten a door; it is not a Church door, either of

* This is my body.

Rome or any other, in this case; but the door of the kingdom. Nor is there any real door, any more than a real key; but something that amounts to both.

When we do not understand a subject; we require A KEY TO THE DIFFICULTY; in other words, AN EXPLANATION.

A key to arithmetic, is a book that explains how to do the sums we could not do alone. So a key to the kingdom of heaven, is an explanation of its terms; letting us into a subject that is naturally beyond us.

Observe then, how the gospel is frequently described—as a MYSTERY; the hidden wisdom or purpose of God, which eye had not seen, nor heart or mind entertained; but to which Christ gave his Apostles the key; *that they might thus unlock the secrets of the divine will; and put into God's book, what was for ages locked up in his mind.* And this is why the teaching of the gospel is a revealed mystery; a lock, opened by divine inspiration: we could not find out God and his will; no key of human construction, could open that treasure; but Christ came to give the keys of the kingdom; to explain and declare what men could not discover.

No one but he could give those keys; because, only he knew these things:—"no man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him:" he has given the keys. For "no man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him:"—to whom Christ will impart the keys. These keys therefore being the explanation or means of opening the secrets of the divine will, were given by Christ, who alone knew those secrets. No man cometh to the Father but by him; not only because of his atonement, but because he is the manifestation of the divine nature on earth;—"he that hath seen me hath seen the Father." But men could not see him; "the darkness comprehended it not:" therefore even Christ must be more fully revealed to his own disciples to fit them for the apostleship. They wanted a key to the strange events of his life; and this they had, when their eyes were opened and their tongues unloosed on the day of Pentecost.

The gift of the Spirit, was then the gift of the keys; it opened all things; and let the multitudes into the wonders and privileges of this new kingdom.

To this purpose our Lord constituted men Apostles—that they might know, and thus have the keys; that they might teach, and thus use the keys: (Eph. iv. 7—13.) in this manner hath God "abounded towards us in all wisdom and prudence," "having made known to us the mystery of his will,"—unlocked his previously hidden purpose,—“to gather together in one, all things in Christ.”

And as the Holy Spirit, was the key or explanation to the Apostles, so the writings they have bequeathed to us, "in words which the Holy Ghost teacheth," form the key for the whole world.

In other words, the New Testament, that grand work of the Holy Ghost, is now the key of the kingdom.

This key unlocks what the world never opened by its own wisdom;—the doctrine of God, of the soul, of sin, of pardon, of renewal.

All these were formerly hidden from men; but are now fully opened by the keys, given to Peter and the rest of the Apostles, who have done

their endeavours, that after their decease we might have all these things in remembrance: hence this record or key called the New Testament.

The learned author of "An Exposition of the Parables" affords an interesting illustration of this point—that A KEY IS A MEANS OF EXPLAINING a difficulty:—in his chapter on the "method of treating the Parables," (vol. 1. chap. xi.) he enquires after the "*interpretation*" of the parables; and observes that for this interpretation, "A KEY OR CLUE, which will *decypher* or unravel a given series of symbolical facts, is necessary."

Here the term "KEY" is used in the secondary sense of translating or *decyphering* any peculiar or secret characters. Thus persons corresponding with each other in times of danger and commotion, employ a secret method of cyphers or letters unknown to others; to interpret those letters, is to decypher them; and this is done by the key,—discovering the meaning of this private system. Short-hand also requires a key, or explanation of the characters. This method of expression occurs several times in the chapter above referred to:—"the interpretation of an allegory, where we are left to conjecture, is difficult:—when we are possessed of *the key, we may solve an allegory* with facility; its own key, will open the most intricate lock;" that is, the true method of interpretation will fit the difficulties of a parable or allegory. Accordingly, this author adopts our Lord's interpretation of the parable of the Sower, "as a pattern or model of all future explanations"—the master-key to all the other parables. "A RIGHT DEFINITION OF THE KEY of a given allegory, (is) that IT IS SOMETHING WHICH WILL EXPLAIN every part;—what will explain every part of an allegory, is its key."*

These incidental illustrations, will sufficiently familiarise the mind of the reader with the proper use of our Lord's metaphor—I give to thee the KEYS;—the explanations of, or means of understanding and entering my kingdom.

And this was fulfilled when the Apostles received power from on high to become intelligent witnesses of Christ; that is, not merely eye-witnesses of his life, death and resurrection, (all which events still left them much in the dark) but *interpreters of the meaning of those events*; by the aid of that Spirit which was the Apostles' key.

And since they spake not with the enticing words of man's wisdom, but in words which the Holy Ghost taught; since their writings are not the word of man, but in truth the word of God; *the book they have thus left is our key, as much as the Holy Ghost was their key.*

As they learned by direct inspiration what flesh and blood could not reveal; so we learn from their teaching how to unlock the divine mysteries.

This doctrine of the keys, we find exactly supported by Master William Tyndale, an early translator of the Scriptures into English.

In his work on "the obedience of a Christian man," he observes: "The keys whereof they [the English Popish Bishops] so greatly boast themselves, are no carnal things, but spiritual, *and nothing else save knowledge of the law, and of the promises of the gospel*; if any man for lack of spiritual feeling [be so carnal as to] desire authority of men, let him read the old doctors, [in proof.] If any man [being spiritual] desire authority

* Edward Greswell, B.D., on the Parables.

of Scripture, Christ saith (Luke xi.) woe be to you lawyers, for ye have taken away THE KEY OF KNOWLEDGE [as the Papists in hiding the Bible, or in burying it under tradition, notes and false translations:] ye enter not in yourselves, and them that come in, ye forbid. That is, they had with glosses and traditions blinded the Scripture, whose knowledge (*as it were a key*) letteth into [the will of] God.

Likewise findest thou (Matt. xxiii.) as Peter answered in the name of all; so Christ promised him the keys in the person of all, (Matt. xvi.) And in the xxth of John he *paid them* [fulfilled the promise to give the keys] saying, receive the Holy Ghost. And for that [equivalent to the saying in John] Luke saith, then opened he their wits, that they might understand the Scriptures."

In other words the writer takes the enlightenment of the Apostles, by the Holy Spirit, as their key: and that the preaching or teaching of the Apostles is our key, is also his opinion. "Peter in Acts ii, practised his keys, by preaching the law," and when the people were thus pricked in their hearts, seeking to escape the condemned cell, "then they brought forth the key of the sweet promises." "Moreover," says our author on "the practice of Prelates," "with this term—Peter's seat—they juggle apace (as with infinite other) saying that Peter's seat is the chief seat; but what Peter's seat is, that they tell you not. . . . Christ saith in the gospel (Matt. xxiii.) the Scribes and Pharisees sit on Moses' seat. What was the seat there, a chair, or the temple, or the Churches, or synagogue of the land? Nay verily, for Moses came never there. But Moses' seat was Moses' law and doctrine; even so Peter's seat is Peter's doctrine, the gospel of Christ which he taught. AND THE SAME DOCTRINE IS PETER'S KEYS: so that his seat, his keys, and his doctrine, is all one thing:—*nothing save the gospel of Christ.*"

Now this teaching of the Apostles, is preserved on record for us, that we may by this Bible which is our key, unlock the casket of God's promises.

"The ever memorable Mr. John Hales, of Eaton College," in a Tract concerning the power of the keys, dated "from my study, this 8th day of March, 1637," confirms these views. "The natural way is to see what the use of keys properly [literally] taken is; and after that, what means they are, which in our endeavours to attain the kingdom of heaven, have something proportionable to the use of keys.—The only use of keys is to open and shut, to admit us into, or exclude us from the possession of what we seek. The kingdom of heaven is compared to a house, from which all the sons of Adam are by nature excluded; whatsoever then it is that gives us way, that removes all obstacles which hinder us from entrance; *that* must be understood by the name of keys. Now all these means [of entrance] were all laid down in the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, committed by him fully and first of all to the Apostles, to be reported all the world over. So that *Claves Regni Cœlorum sunt Doctrina Evangelii.*" *The keys of the kingdom of heaven, are the teaching of the gospel:*—the doctrines of the New Testament. He further adds, "the managing or application of the keys, so far forth as men are entrusted with them, is the manifestation of the doctrine of the gospel:"—preaching Christianity.

So then a key is that which opens, or explains; which solves a mystery. God's purposes in Christ, were mysteries, which flesh and blood did not

reveal to the Apostles, but the Holy Ghost, which was to them the key. And what they have written under that guidance, the gospel is the key to us.

II. *To whom then do these keys belong?*

We might as wisely ask—to whom does the sun belong? The answer is, to all who have eyes: and so the Bible belongs to all who have souls.

But since some have set up for a monopoly, we shall examine their rights.

There are three parties, that may put in a claim for these keys

1. The professed successors of Peter.
2. The professed successors of the Apostles in general.
3. All mankind.

First, the professed successors of Peter set up an exclusive claim or monopoly: this is the pretence of the Church of Rome; and on its strength or its weakness, they lock all heretics (that is Christians) out of the kingdom. But Rome is the only kingdom belonging to the Pope; and he nearly lost that kingdom a little time ago: in the hurry of his flight he missed his keys, and not finding them before his return, he employed those picklocks, jemmies, or other burglarious instruments called French Bayonets. The kingdom of Rome and the kingdom of heaven, are however exact opposites at present: yet it is to the keys of the latter the Pope lays a claim, in the name of Peter, whom he succeeds. It is not exactly a legitimate succession, for though Peter fed Christ's lambs, it was not with cannon balls.

The Scripture on which this militant head of the Church Catholic founds his right to the keys, is Matt. xvi. 13—19. In which are these words,—“Thou art Peter . . . and I will give unto THEE the keys of the kingdom of heaven.” It would certainly have fitted better, if our Lord had said,—“Thou art Pope of Rome,—thou art Pius IX;” but as he mentioned only Peter, quite another individual, plain men will wonder, what that has to do with the Pope any more than with the Emperor of China.

But they get out of this, by saying they are Peter's successors; and any other may say the same; “’tis as easy as lying,” and much the same thing.

It is however very unfortunate for the Pope and his Church; that *if he were proved Peter's successor, the text would not help him*: since it happens to make no provision for successors. They are not mentioned in the “deeds.”

The only plan therefore left for his Holiness, is to extend the doctrine of transubstantiation, and prove that as the wafer is turned into Christ, so the Pope is turned into Peter. One is just as good as the other. And this suggestion ought to gain for us the title of “*defender of the faith*.” Indeed, there is no other defence: for whilst the Catholic Head recites “thou art Peter,” Protestant infants reply with perplexing coolness—“*thou art not Peter*,” and there the matter ends.

There is nothing therefore for it, but transubstantiation. The doctrine of succession fails as a fact; and if proved, does not help matters: the promise was to Peter, not his heirs at law. Nor can the succession be proved—there is no proof of Peter ever having been at Rome; so he is not likely to have left his keys there behind him.

Peter's diocese was Judea; and his feelings leaned almost exclusively to the Jews; as seen in the difficulty he experienced in visiting Cornelius. (Acts x.) That these were his peculiar sheep, the lambs HE was to feed, is manifest from his first epistle, to "the strangers of the dispersion," the scattered Israelites; and from the direct assertion of the apostle Paul "that the gospel of the uncircumcision (*i. e.* of the Gentiles) was committed to me, as the gospel of the circumcision (*i. e.* of the Jews) was (committed) unto Peter."—(Gal. ii. 7.) In this whole chapter Peter's Hebrew leaning and prejudice, are exhibited even to *dissimulation*. It is plain from this, THAT PAUL AND NOT PETER, WAS THE APOSTLE TO THE ROMANS. For besides the assertion that Peter's commission was to the Jews, and Paul's to the Gentiles, we find that in this relationship he does actually address the Romans:—"for I speak to YOU GENTILES, *inasmuch as I am an apostle of the Gentiles.*"—(Rom. xi. 13.)

It seems pretty plain further from these and other considerations, that the Roman Christians were Paul's converts,—because of the *official* authority he assumes over them. This he would not have assumed except over his own peculiar flock: "we will not boast of things without our measure; but according to the measure of the rule which God hath distributed to us, a measure to reach even to you. For we are come as far as to you also in preaching the gospel of Christ. Not boasting of things beyond our measure, that is, *of other men's labour*; but having hope, when your faith is increased, that we shall be enlarged by you according to our rule abundantly, to preach the gospel in the regions beyond you, and *not to boast in another man's line of things made ready to our hands.*"—(2 Cor. x. 13—16.)

The rule of Paul then was, not to entrench on another Apostle's ground; but to expect from his own converts, the means of carrying the gospel into fresh places.

If then Peter founded the Roman Church, did not Paul violate his own rule, and belie himself by writing with such official authority to the Romans; not only obtruding into another man's line of things, but requiring of these the very same kind of furtherance as he says is the peculiar rule for his own converts?—money to carry his message into the regions beyond. He frequently desired to go to them, that he might "have some *fruit* among them also, even as among other Gentiles." And this fruit was to enable him to discharge this obligation, "I am a debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians:"—in other words, to pay his way in travelling to preach.

The authority he assumed over them, as being in his line of things, is manifest in the saying—"I have written the more boldly unto you, as putting you in mind (reminding them of what they had learned before,) because of the grace that is given to me of God, that I (not Peter) should be the minister of Christ to (you) the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up (*i. e.* the contributions) of the Gentiles might be acceptable."—(Rom. xv. 15, 16.) This is, according to his rule, to expect offerings from his own converts, that he might go and gain fresh ones,—"*yea so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation.*"—(Rom. xv. 20.) Now he who was so scrupulous of intrusion in preach-

ing, would be more so in writing, and not in either way build on another's foundation: at least, he would write with peculiar modesty, and the absence of personal authority.

There is none of this carefulness in writing to the Romans; but besides expecting "some fruit," "the offering up of the Gentiles," he expresses the same usual requirement from his converts,—“to be brought on my way thitherward by you,” that is, at your expense.—(Rom. xv. 24.) From all this we conclude, that whilst there is no evidence of Peter ever having been at Rome; there is unquestionable proof of Paul being the founder of the Church; proof drawn from Paul's Epistle to the Church, especially as compared with his rule of conduct asserted both in this and other epistles. **AND THIS PROOF EXCLUDES PETER** from all official connexion with them; because Paul who interfered at Rome, says he never goes into another man's province. Therefore Rome was not Peter's province.

In connexion with this, it will no doubt be a very unpleasant reflection to our successor at Rome of Peter who was never there,—**THAT THIS SAME PETER WROTE NO EPISTLE TO ROME**; Paul's epistle is Paul's key—cannot the Pope invent an epistle from Peter?

Sometimes however, to put a good grace on matters, the Pope is the successor both of Peter AND Paul; which is putting two faces on, and shewing either, as the exigency or argument requires.

Whether he may not also have condensed James' Jerusalem Bishopric into the same See, is uncertain; but perhaps this suggestion will explain the style of the Roman head-piece, from which his Holiness is profanely called “the triple-hatted tyrant.”

They have on occasion, at least two cards, Peter and Paul: playing sometimes one, sometimes the other: sometimes both: it is the fisher or the tentmaker; or both;—a jack of all trades.

But we have seen that Peter had nothing to do with Rome; whilst neither Paul nor Peter's successors are named in the legacy, “Thou art Peter, and I will give unto THEE the Keys.” So that Peter had no connexion with Rome, and Paul none with the (Pope's) keys: and therefore the Pope has forged them. We know of only two considerations which can even apparently weaken the force of any part of the above reasoning.

First, it may be objected, that Paul did interfere with another man's line of things, in the epistle to the Hebrews, whom he acknowledges to belong to Peter. But this epistle is *without a name*; and whilst in general Paul preached to the Gentiles, he also preached to Jews; *but not when other Apostles had formed a Church*; especially he did not write to such; nor in the manner of personal relation and official authority assumed in writing to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, &c. It is upon this particular manner that the argument mainly turns: the question being one *entirely of PERSONAL AUTHORITY*. Now this is studiously avoided in the epistle to the Hebrews, (whoever wrote it:) nor is any reference made by the writer to himself, till the eighteenth verse of the last chapter. So that there is no manner of comparison between the personal relation assumed in the two epistles to the Romans and the Hebrews.

Secondly, it may be objected, that according to some passages in the epistle to the Romans, Paul would seem not to have been there. As for

instance where he expresses a desire to see them; and regret that he has been hindered hitherto.—(Rom. i. 13—15. Rom. xv. 22—24.) But besides that, another construction must be put on these places, consistently with the Apostle's own declared rule; it is evident from similar statements in other epistles, *that he refers not to seeing them the first time*, but to his desire to visit them again.

In writing to the Corinthians he says,—“moreover I call God to record that to spare you I came not yet to Corinth.”—(2 Cor. i. 23.) But are we therefore to conclude that he was never there before? The whole epistle, and the preceding one, prove this conclusion would be false. Therefore as here, so in the Romans, he speaks of *subsequent visits*: for in the same epistle he tells them—“behold the **THIRD TIME**, I am ready to come to you :”—(2 Cor. xii. 14.) “this is the **THIRD TIME** I am coming to you.”—(2 Cor. xiii. 1.)

The numerous personal salutations and remembrances, contained in the last chapter of the epistle to the Romans, prove that Paul had been there and formed friendships on the spot. One of these remembrances is peculiarly touching—“salute Herodian my *kinsman*; salute Rufus *and his mother and mine*.” He refers also to others who had “helped” him (plainly at Rome); and “many who (at Rome) bestowed much labour on us.”—(Rom. xvi. 6.)

The foundation and progress of the Church at Rome, are recorded in the last chapter of the Acts; the chief of the Jews in the city, were sent for by Paul, immediately on his arrival at Rome as a prisoner: *no Christians were sent for*: no members or rulers of a Church visited him, which would have been the case, had Christians beforehand been collected into a Church there.

But some few of the Jews believed, whilst of the majority Paul said,—“be it known unto you therefore, that the salvation of God is sent to the Gentiles, and they *will* hear it.”—(Acts xxviii. 28.)

Accordingly, Paul's “hired house” was the scene where the first foundation of the Romish Church was laid: where he desired that “utterance might be given, to make known the mystery of the gospel,” for which he was “an ambassador in bonds.”—(Eph. vi. 19, 20.) The two years spent in this hired house, (receiving as many as came to him) were not without effect; “so that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace and in all other places, and many of the brethren in the Lord (who had been converted by Paul) waxing confident, are much more bold to speak the word.”—(Philip. i. 13, 14.) And he concludes his epistle to the Philippians, saying, “all the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Cæsar's household.”—(Philip. iv. 22.)

Paul therefore is the original bishop of Rome; so that if Peter had the keys, the Pope is locked out; since he is neither Peter, nor Peter's successor; and consequently the claim on either of these grounds is set aside for ever.

And we are sure Paul will not own the Pope—who is very much afraid that his deluded flock should read and understand Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

That letter is a key which belongs to the people, and was addressed not to one—the deceiver of Rome, but to many,—the believers at Rome.

The true successors of Peter are those who imitate his devotedness and humility, according to his directions "feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof not by constraint, but willingly: not *for filthy lucre*,—neither as being LORDS over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock."—(1 Pet. v. 2, 3.) His pretended successors have intimated not his self-denial but his denial of his master; they must therefore go out and weep bitterly; and *when converted*, they like him may strengthen their brethren. Until this be the case, Peter's successors faithful to his apostacy, have as their legacy, that rebuke contained in the same chapter as the keys—"But *he turned and said unto Peter, get THEE BEHIND ME SATAN*, for thou savourest not of the things that be of God, but those that be of men."—(Matt. xvi. 23.)

Thus far then, we have seen how the plain metaphors of our Lord, intended to make his truth clear by obvious illustrations, have been turned into the mystery of merchandize, or craft of power and trade by a usurping priesthood: that keys are to open, to afford entrance and security: that the keys of the kingdom of heaven, were the means of explaining its mysteries and securing its promises: that the Holy Ghost, was the key given to the Apostles; and the Bible the key left for us.

But that this free gospel has been seized upon by monopolists; amongst the first of whom are the assumed porters of heaven and hell, who keep the key of the lodge in Peter's name; that all passengers may pay "Peter-pence."

These monopolists by means of a Popish Bull, have decided upon Rome as the seat of Peter's authority; a place which Peter is not known to have visited: and where Paul was the undoubted and sole founder and Apostle of the Church.

Whilst neither Paul nor Peter were ever settled Bishops, confined to a town or congregation, but wandering preachers: so that the Pope wanders far from both of them, by stopping at home and not preaching at all.

N. B. There are two other classes on whose behalf the keys are demanded; but we shall defer the conclusion of this enquiry to the next article in this department of "THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE:"—"Peter's keys transferred the owners," in which we shall take the Pope's late Bull by the horns.

III.

STATESMEN'S RELIGION.

"EVERY PLANT WHICH MY HEAVENLY FATHER HATH NOT PLANTED, SHALL BE ROOTED UP."—(Matt. xv. 13.)

In those who think a national Church right, dissent is a sin; in those who think it wrong, silence is a shame.

WE INTENDED in this our first article on "Statesmen's Religion," to have entered into a full explanation of our views and purposes on this important question; and to shew that Scripture, reason, and experience alike declare against the alliance of religion with civil power and State pay; but the following curious document, apparently written by a clergyman, having fallen into our hands, we present it to our readers, to see if they can unravel its mystery.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE PARABLE OF SAINT MARTIN'S SPIRE.

(After the manner of the Rev. EDWARD GRESWELL, B.D., Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.)

THE reasons and nature of parables, together with the method of interpretation, being set forth with great learning, penetration, and judgment, by a member of our Church, and printed at the press of our ancient renowned, godly, and loyal University of Oxford; there is the less necessity (gentle reader) for our trouble, or your patience, in travelling over that extensive though edifying subject. It shall therefore be our care, to apply the same, as concisely as we may be able, to that post-canonical parable lately uttered, and called THE PARABLE OF ST. MARTIN'S SPIRE.

No true churchman will be wanting in the appropriate emotions arising from so lofty a theme which

"Points to heaven and leads the way."

There is one important principle laid down by the learned author on "Parables,"—that they are not based upon fictions, but give historical realities, as a means of conveying moral truth and important information.

Accordingly the parable we have chosen, that of Saint Martin's Spire, is a real event; fully known and recognized, openly published and duly authenticated.

And we have the greater facility in explaining this, inasmuch as the various accounts are in strict verbal agreement; leaving no necessity for

the collation and comparison of different authors,—by the statements of one to fill up the omissions of another.

We therefore proceed at once, without tediousness on the one hand, or embarrassment on the other,—to read our parabolic text; which is as followeth:—

“*St. Martin's Vestry, June 15, 1850.*”

“Apprehensions have been excited from time to time for the safety of the *Spire* of this ancient and venerable fabric; a spire inferior to none in the kingdom for symmetrical elegance and beauty. These apprehensions have been grounded not so much on the *twist* or *inclination* of the upper part of it, so decided as to be visible to every eye, as on the dilapidated state of the stone on the west, north-west, and south-west sides—on the existence of large cracks, caused by the action of lightning—and on the fact that, from time to time, portions of the stone have actually fallen away.

“In the course of last summer public alarm had arisen to such a height that Wardens felt it to be their duty to have the Spire thoroughly examined by two Architects of repute. The result of their examination, left the Wardens no alternative but to take steps, either for the removal, the repair, or the restoration of the Spire—a structure regarded by every man, as a chief ornament to the town.

“The mere *removal* of the Spire would have been universally regarded as a disgrace. From the mere *repair* of it the Wardens were strongly dissuaded by their Architect, on account of the extent to which the dilapidation has gone. Supported by the decision of a meeting of the Congregation of Saint Martin's, they determined that it should be taken down and rebuilt. This (including the cost of scaffolding) would, it was estimated have involved an expenditure of £2,450.

“It then became matter for serious consideration whether, when the state of the *Tower* and of the *Body* of the sacred edifice was regarded, the expenditure of so large a sum on a *partial and patchwork* restoration would give general satisfaction; and not, rather, bring out into greater prominence the unsightly appearance of the other parts of the exterior, caused as it is with red brick.

“After mature and anxious deliberation, the Committee appointed by the Congregation determined to recommend the **ENTIRE EXTERNAL RESTORATION.**

“The recommendation of the Committee has been adopted by the Congregation, and from the very decided expression of public feeling in the town, there can be no doubt that in the attempt to accomplish this great object, the Committee will receive almost universal support.

“The estimated cost is, in round numbers, £10,000. The Congregation are prepared to do their utmost. Many liberal donations are already promised from among its members; but such a work is obviously beyond the strength of any Congregation.

“The Committee earnestly and confidently appeal to every resident in the town for co-operation in a work which promises to secure to the town an ecclesiastical edifice worthy of a great Christian community. They know their townsmen too well to suppose that considerations of sect

or party will be allowed to obstruct their undertaking. If in Leeds £30,000., and in Stafford £16,000., were raised for similar objects, they cannot doubt success in Birmingham.

"The Committee would not unduly press the consideration, which yet is not without its weight, that—although now that other Rectories and Incumbencies have been cut off from it, Saint Martin's can no longer claim the position of the Parish Church—this ancient and venerable structure may still be deemed the Mother-Church.

"But the Committee confidently appeal to higher motives than any yet touched on—"Is it time for you, O ye, to dwell in your ceiled houses, and this house to lie waste?"—was the exhortation of GOD to ancient Israel by the mouth of His prophet. And although we must beware of overlaying the simplicity of Christianity with outward pomp and ceremony, it can never be otherwise than pleasing to the devout Christian, and, we humbly believe, acceptable to HIM we serve, that architectural skill and beauty should be consecrated to the service of GOD, by being employed in His House of Prayer, in which His Gospel is preached and His Holy Sacraments administered.

"The encouragement already given to the Committee in this sacred work more than confirms their anticipations of the good feeling and liberality of their fellow-townsmen, and they gladly hear them saying in response to this appeal—"*Arise and Build.*"

Signed in behalf of the Committee,
JOHN C. M., M.A."

There are three things in this parable which demand our attention; first, the MATERIAL CIRCUMSTANCES described and alluded to; secondly, THE MORAL of the parable,—its spiritual drift and meaning: thirdly, ITS INTERPRETATION, or specific application to our Church and times. These points we shall briefly consider, in the order of their enumeration.

I. the material circumstances described and alluded to in this parable.

The scene, indeed the entire fabric of the narration, is Saint Martin's church, an ancient and venerable edifice; built by our pious ancestors, to edify us in the true faith. Not to weary the reader with archaeological enquiries, it is sufficient to observe, (in the words of the History and Directory of Birmingham,) "this building is the ancient parish church, the antiquity of which is too remote for historical light, its records having fallen a prey to time, and the revolution of things." This is a sad picture and suggests that our Church may have arisen in the dark ages: let us hope it was a light to many; and that its own records may yet be discovered.

This at least is some consolation, in the absence of further records, to know that (whereas some say our church was founded by Henry VIII, and endowed by national funds, of which, some would schismatically deprive us,) our venerable church had "its foundation in the eighth century," and the present edifice arose at "the beginning of the thirteenth." "In 1690, the church and tower were cased with brick;" thus hath it defied the ravages of time, by self renovation.

True, the "spire has been several times injured by lightning, and its altitude diminished;" but it still rises predominant, and in fact and law is loftier than the most aspiring conventicle. The certainty and justice

with which its temporal income (one of the *material* circumstances of the parable,—at present £1,048, with the “Rectory, a large neat mansion,”)—the certainty with which we may claim the indefeasible and *original* right to its temporal property—independent of any political premium attached to a parliamentary creed,—is palpably manifest from the fact that “in the year 1331, Walter de Clodshale, of Saltley, gave certain lands and messuages for the founding of a chantry at the ALTAR OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN, in this church, and for maintaining *one* PRIEST to celebrate divine service there, *for the souls of himself, his wife, their ancestors, and all the faithful* DECEASED. His son Richard, gave other lands for the LIKE PURPOSE. Richard de Clodshale, by his last will, dated Edgbaston, 1428, bequeathed his body for sepulture in this church—“*in his own proper chapel of OUR LADY.*”

Thus has this venerable edifice enshrined the truth, and maintained till now, independent of *national gifts or political transferences of property*, its own inalienable possessions.

Nevertheless, having little more than a thousand pounds a year for the support of the unchanged gospel, (to say nothing of surplice fees)—no congregation, however wealthy, could with so miserable a help, maintain that splendour and dignity becoming the house of God: hence it is in ruins; and the parable concludes—“arise and build.” Who would not help in so pious a work,—at once religious and charitable, advancing the divine glory, and meeting the *necessities* of a Christian people.

It may be useful to guard the reader against a misapplication of one material circumstance contained in this parable: to wit, the appeal to different sects, that apart from sectarianism, they should provide for a *public ornament*. It must not be supposed that a church is a Town Hall, for public and *common* use; the public have the honour of its beauty and splendour, but the building is solely for the uses of the Church of England.

Nor must we so far extend latitudinarian principles or mistake the Act of Toleration, as to suppose that the appeal may be reciprocated by those who have schismatically departed from our venerable Establishment. It is true, many dissenting places might be dignified, but they could never be public ornaments; being a part of those “offences” which though they “must needs be,” because of our unhappy divisions,—“woe is unto him, by whom the offence cometh.”

Whilst therefore we would not exclude any dissenting brethren from the privilege of contributing to the common good, to the beauty of our architecture, and the dignity of divine worship; we must not on this account be partakers of their sins, and perpetuate confusion by helping to render their conventicles more attractive.

Dissenters from our Church, are the last to require of us a compromise of principle; nor can these remarks be deemed contrary to the spirit of charity, inasmuch as the Church is ever open to their return; and then its decorations as well as its noble liturgy will be theirs as well as ours.

And thus much we thought fit to advance respecting the material circumstance of this parable.

II. THE MORAL, or spiritual drift of this parable, hath next to be briefly stated, in order to pave the way for its true and specific application.

That there is a spiritual significance couched under the description of Saint Martin's Spire, can be denied only by the greatest scepticism, which is the same thing as the greatest credulity: there is no faith larger than that which believes nothing to be true.

Everything has a meaning; but some things are preeminently expressive: and hence we lay it down as an axiom, that under the real figure of Saint Martin's, *we have pictured before us* THE CONDITION OF OUR CHURCH AND THE NECESSITIES OF THESE TIMES.

This key indeed is contained in the parable itself, as is obvious to the enquiring and curious eye, from these words—"this ancient and venerable structure, may still be *deemed* the Mother-Church."

Such a phrase can only be *mystically* regarded, as a symbol of the true Mother-Church of these realms; which is in reality no stone fabric, but "a congregation of faithful men;" a spiritual house, aptly represented in parables by "this ancient structure."

This being granted, we may further observe, (before proceeding to the interpretation of the various points in the parable,) that an important principle is involved; namely, THE CHURCH DOES NOT DENY THE VOLUNTARY PRINCIPLE, and therefore all pretences for dissent are de facto set aside. It is true we deny the sufficiency of State aid: both principles are true; but their admirable nature is seen best in their *union*. Dissent is manifold, but truth is uniting; it forms all elements into one grand system, and becomes like the Apostle—"all things to all men," in order to gain as much as possible, whether from Christian rulers or Christian subjects. And what is more reasonable than that we should take what we can get—whether by force or persuasion? This is the true method of unity and comprehension, employing both the enforced aid of the State and the begging letters of appeal to the charitable—"the smallest contributions gratefully received and thankfully acknowledged."

Some may no doubt object, that all payments were voluntary in Judaism; that there was no process of distraining for tithes; and if there were, the laws of England were not made on Mount Sinai. But all this arises from a spirit of levity in quoting the Scriptures against the religion of our country.

Such practices stand rebuked by the more solemn and appropriate appeal to Scripture, continued in this parable;—"Is this the time for you, O ye, to dwell in your ceiled houses, and this House to lie waste?—was the exhortation of God to ancient Israel by the mouth of his prophet."

That the Temple of Jerusalem was built and repaired on the voluntary principle, we readily admit; and to the same principle we appeal (when compulsoryism fails,) for the repair of our churches.

But should it be objected, that the above appeal is not applicable in our case;—since our clergy are not the prophet, our religion not Judaism, and Saint Martin's (or any other church) not *this* house at Jerusalem;—in fine that such appeal might as reasonably be made, and such a use of Scripture by a Romanist or a Sectary;—it is a sufficient reply to these libertine and unenglish sentiments,—that a refutation is needless to a true churchman, and would prove useless to a self-sufficient dissenter.

THE MORAL of this parable therefore, consisteth of two grand points,—that it setteth forth the voluntary principle as a useful supplement to

State aid; and that it indicateth the condition of our Church, and the necessities of these times.

What that condition and these necessities are, the reader may learn from the

III. Third department of our exposition; namely, the interpretation or specific application of this parable.

And first, we must caution the careless against any misapprehension, respecting the proposed addition of "architectural skill and beauty to the service of God;" we do not propose to outvie the Catholics in this matter; yet our "skill and beauty" cannot be otherwise than "acceptable to him" who "dwelleth not in temples made with hands." Nature herself teaches us that our offerings and worship should be consistent, our buildings should accord in decency and splendour, with God's gospel and "his holy sacraments."

"The existence of large cracks, caused by lightning," shews that truth or light is breaking in upon us; and where is light more appropriate than in a church? For though the Bishop of London (*before* the popish aggression) allowed his clergy to have candles on the altar;—*provided they were not lighted*—in accordance with the command "place your candle on the altar that it may not give light;" yet we must now "come to the light that our deeds may be reprov'd," otherwise the light will come to us. And if it cannot enter through the stained windows, it must come down the belfry, through "the cracks caused by lightning."

It is vain to fight against the elements of nature, which are in the hand of the Creator; and this heavy affliction came upon our holy Church, through the unfortunate schism of the Gorham law-suit. And though the Privy Council endeavoured with untempered mortar, to stop up the chinks and crannies thus deplorably manifest, all hope from this quarter is helpless, since "portions of the stone have actually fallen away." So that an enemy taking up the proverb might say,—"*Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings are here!*" And Jesus answering said, *Seest thou these great buildings? there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.*"—(Mark xiii. 1, 2.) It is time therefore to save "great Babylon, that Nebuchadnezzar built, for the house of the kingdom, by the might of his power:" for "her battlements are not the Lord's."

The *encasement of the body and tower in red brick*, evidently hath reference to the REFORMATION, when "Stark Popery" with which some would now deluge our Church and country, was covered up and imbedded deep in our public formularies,—to be dug up and brought into unsightly prominence by our Tractarians; who looking only at the interior of the church, forget its Protestant professions,—the casement of red brick.

Externally our church holds only what may be proved from the Scriptures: for according to the sixth article, our Church teaches, that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not required of any man that it should be believed."

This is the Protestant element in our glorious Establishment; but whereas everything hath now already a long time since, been proved by the Church out of the Scriptures, and put down in the Prayer-book, *that*

is the only valid and legal authority: *hence our Church Courts NEVER QUOTE THE BIBLE*, but always and only the Prayer-book.

In this therefore, we find the Catholic element preserved; and happily for us, our Church claims authority in matters of faith, having made all the use of the Bible that it is allowable or reasonable to make.

And therefore "all may learn to address themselves to God, through Christ their Redeemer, in these solemn forms, which sacred Synods, and Civil Authorities have published and confirmed for those great ends."*

The 20th Article of our Church declares that "the Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith: and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything, that is contrary to God's word written:" and to this lawful authority the Church of England confines herself, since she again *declares, that nothing she enforces is contrary to that written word.*

Wherefore she is Protestant in adopting the Bible standard, and Catholic in asserting that her use of that standard hath extracted truth only.

Accordingly by her 36th Canon, she defines "the subscription to be required of such as are to be made ministers."

Namely, 1st, the Sovereign's Supremacy "in spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as well as temporal."

2. "That the Book of Common Prayer, and of ordering of bishops, priests, and deacons, containeth in it *nothing contrary to the will of God.*"

3. "That he acknowledgeth all and every of the Articles, being in number nine and thirty, *besides THE RATIFICATION*, to be agreeable to the word of God."

And for *the avoiding all ambiguities*, he shall subscribe this order and form of words, setting down both his Christian name and surname, viz:—I, N. N. do willingly and ex animo subscribe to these three articles above mentioned, *and to all things contained in them.*"

Thus doth our Church verify and explain the parable, in one explanation of one important passage, viz. that it hath a "*twist or inclination* of the upper part, so decided as to be visible to every eye." This twist consists in leaning two ways;—to Protestantism in declaring the Bible sufficient;—to Catholicism in declaring the sufficiency and finality of her interpretations of the Bible. So have we the good of both systems; nor can we listen to the sneers of Romanists, who pretend to have the same principles, namely—the Bible, as interpreted by the Church.

Some indeed may suppose that our Church hath three inclinations, or leans three ways, since we have the Bible, the Church, and the Civil Ruler: but our sectaries, surely cannot be so disloyal to her Majesty Victoria, as to deny to her an authority conceded to Cyrus and Darius. (See Ezra.)

There can consequently be no objection in the minds of loyal Englishmen, to acknowledge the ratification of the Church's decisions: for herein our great strength lieth,—the threefold cord, the Bible, the Church and the Crown:—that the Bible has in it all that is necessary; that the Church hath extracted all such necessary articles out of it; and that the ratification by the Sovereign is equally a Bible article. Behind this triple wall of brass, we may bid defiance to all assaults. Grant us

* Wheatley's Church of England Man's Companion.

this to stand upon, and if we cannot move the earth, we shall not be moved ourselves. Sceptics may sneer, sectaries may cavil, but "none of these things move us."

Whilst an Apostle tells us to "submit unto the king as supreme," (1 Pet. ii. 13.) we can be in no danger in obeying this supremacy; nor are we to be moved from this interpretation, by the factious allusion to another saying of Peter, "whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye."—(Acts iv. 19.)

It is therefore with sacred confidence we turn to the authority of our articles, constitutions and canons ecclesiastical: which is as followeth:—

"We, of our princely inclination and royal care for the maintenance and present estate and government of the Church of England, by the laws of this realm now settled and established, having diligently, with great contentment and comfort, read and considered of all their said canons, orders, ordinances and constitutions, have therefore, for us, our heirs and lawful successors, of our *especial grace*, certain knowledge, and mere motion, given our royal assent *according to the form of the Statute or Act of Parliament*, to all and every of the said canons, &c. And command the same to be diligently observed by all our loving subjects. Straightly charging and commanding all archbishops, bishops, and all other that exercise any ecclesiastical jurisdiction within this realm, to see and procure all and every of the same, to be in all points duly observed; *not sparing to execute the penalties* in them severally mentioned, upon any that shall wittingly or wilfully break or neglect to observe the same, as they tender the *honour of God*, the peace of the Church, the tranquillity of the kingdom, and *their duties and service to us* their king and sovereign."

The following "ratification," is printed at the end of the Articles in the Prayer Book,—“This book of Articles before rehearsed, is again approved, and *allowed* to be holden and executed within the realm, by the assent and consent of our sovereign lady Elizabeth, by the grace of God, of England, France, and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, &c.”

Thus we have assurance upon assurance, though some would vainly persuade us to come outside our defences, or throw down our invulnerable breastwork,—the Queen's Supremacy and Parliamentary—Statutes in the coming struggle with Catholicism.

No Fox shall be allowed to creep up and break down our stone wall.

The preface to our articles and canons, being "his Majesty's declaration," is still retained in the Book of Common Prayer: where they are introduced by a king, and "ratified" by a queen.

"Being by *God's ordinance*, according to our just title, *Defender of the Faith*, and *supreme governor of the Church*, within these our dominions, we hold it most agreeable to this our kingly office, and our own religious zeal, *to conserve and maintain the Church committed to our charge*, in unity of true religion and bond of peace; and *not to suffer* unnecessary disputations, altercations or questions to be raised, which may nourish faction both in the Church and Commonwealth.

We have therefore, upon mature deliberation, and with the advice of so many of our bishops as might conveniently be called together, thought fit to make this declaration following:—

"That the Articles of the Church of England, do contain the true doctrine of the Church of England, agreeable to God's word: which we do therefore ratify and confirm, requiring *all* our loving subjects to continue in the *uniform profession* thereof, and *prohibiting the least difference from the said articles.*"

Here again we find the three elements before mentioned, Protestantism, in the authority of the Scriptures; Catholicism in the sufficiency and authority of the Church's decisions; and the spiritual supremacy of the Civil Power, to preside over and enforce the Church's teachings.

And this sufficiently vindicates us from the Roman slander,—that we believe less than the Roman Catholic Church, since we plainly believe more, having an authoritative (if not infallible) Church, together with all sufficient Scriptures, and an all powerful defender of the faith.

Accordingly his Majesty declares (in the Book of Common Prayer)

"That out of our princely care that the churchmen (*i. e.* clergy) may do the work which is proper unto them, the bishops and clergy, from time to time in convocation, *upon their humble desire, shall have LICENCE* under our broad seal *to deliberate of, and to do all such things, as, being made plain by them, and ASSENTED UNTO BY US, shall concern the settled continuance of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England now established; from which we will not endure any varying or departing in the least degree.*"

In these various settled and scriptural principles, the Bible, the Church, and the monarch (defences which sectaries may naturally envy, and seek to remove) we have an explanation of one sense of the parabolic saying respecting our Church,—that "*the twist or inclination of the upper part of it, is so decided as to be visible to every eye.*"

But there is a subordinate though not inferior sense, in which we recognize whilst we mourn over a lamentable truth, namely, *the schisms or contentions in our Church*, whereby the upper part is *twisted*, some bishops, dignitaries, and inferior clergy having an *inclination* one way, and some another: so that our only stability is in the laity, who constitute the "*tower and body*" of "*this venerable structure.*"

That our Church is double-tongued in her utterances, no one of her true sons will acknowledge, though some with shameless effrontery, find schisms not only amongst our clergy, but in the formularies of the Church itself!—vainly endeavouring to find truth in the Articles which are signed by the clergy, and falsehood in the services which are performed to the people.

Such a doctrine needs only to be mentioned in order to be repudiated by every true churchman. No! It is the unhappy twist in the eyes of our clergy, that leads them to read differently the "*plain grammatical*" teaching of the Church. And considering the declaration of his Majesty, prefixed to the articles "*for avoiding of DIVERSITY of opinion, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion,*" it is wonderful that this very consent should give rise to diversities. But let none on this account, consider our Church therefore defective; rather may we all lament the weakness of human judgments, that with such a guide still wander in uncertainty.

It is no fault in the constitution of the Church, that such diversity

exists, for she has expressly provided against it, as is plain from "his Majesty's declaration."—"We will, that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the holy Scriptures, and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them.

"And that no man hereafter shall either print or preach, *to draw the article aside any way* [so as to give it a *twist* or *inclination*,] but shall submit to it in the *plain* full meaning thereof: and shall not put *his own sense* or comment to be the meaning of the article, but shall take it in the plain grammatical sense."

It is not for us, but for those in authority, to decide who have (by infringing this law,) fomented our present unhappy divisions.

Whilst we invoke the royal supremacy against the encroachments of Rome, the *same would fall heavily upon many of our clergy*, and grind to powder such as plainly disregard the constitutions and canons of our Church; which indeed *are not very generally obeyed by our clergy*.* Though the declaration already quoted, thus concludes against all departures from these ordinances;—"he or they, the offenders shall be liable to our displeasure, and the Church's censures in our commission ecclesiastical, as well as any other: and WE WILL SEE THAT THERE SHALL BE DUE EXECUTION UPON THEM."

This sword of the magistrate, once drawn, would not be drawn in vain; but would extend to the schismatics in our own Church, as well as to the Romanists and sectaries outside.

But we have now to do with our own communion, the state of our Church, as indicated in the parable of the spire; where we find not only the "*twist or inclination*" already lamented, but an attempt at rectifying this deviation from uprightness.

"In the course of last summer," so our parable symbolizeth, "public alarm had arisen to such a height that the wardens felt it to be their duty to have the spire thoroughly examined by *two architects of repute*."

To what can this refer, except the two trials, in the Court of Arches, and the Privy Council? In these two courts the spire was thoroughly examined; the first declared a decided leaning to Tractarianism, since it took the case as "*visible to every eye*," in the "*plain grammatical sense*" of the Prayer-book; whilst the second court, with a *comprehensiveness* of judgment, turned to a "*charitable construction*," and declared that the upper part visibly leaned both ways, which is the best method of keeping the balance,—preserving the centre of gravity below and between the two declinations.

Thus is manifested the toleration of our Church, in retaining in her communion, those who mutually refute and anathematize each other!

How calm and lofty, how majestic is her demeanour, as she thus raises her head above the waves of these contentions, saying in the words of her invisible head,—"*Peace be still!*" How ardently should every one of her disquieted sons take refuge in her peaceful bosom, as the asylum amidst this storm of human passions!

And whilst some according to our parable, are for a "*partial and patch-*

* The above strange admission, we shall hereafter verify, as we enquire—"Who hears the Church?"

work restoration" some for a "mere repair" of the spire, others for "taking it down, to be entirely rebuilt;" others for "an entire **EXTERNAL RESTORATION**" of the spire, tower and body; others for a new inside as well as outside; advocating a convocation of the clergy, and reconstruction of our glorious constitution in Church and State;—we can only lament this unseemly perturbation, and cling to the noble vessel while a plank is left.

N.B. In future numbers, as early as convenient, we shall discuss under this department of "Statesmen's Religion," the following questions :—

1. *Who founded the Church?*
 2. *Who is the Church?*
 3. *What says the Church?*
 4. *Who hears the Church?*
 5. *Who robs the Church?*
-

IV.

SCEPTICS' RELIGION.

Under this department, sceptical objections, and systems or principles advocated as hostile to Christianity, are dispassionately considered.

FREE THOUGHTS TO FREE-THINKERS.

THE advocate of the Bible, has this difficulty in contending with its opponents, namely, that the latter agree in only one thing—the rejection of the Scriptures. There is no system nor book, to which they subscribe; no one stronghold, which must be stormed or left: but the contest is between a well disciplined army, and bush-rangers, who driven from behind this bush, wall, or stump, scramble to another; and never surrender, because they *occupy no ground*, have no fortress; and skirmish rather than fight. Sometimes they cut off this or that straggling detachment, (some supposed doctrine;) but do not regularly siege the stronghold—the Bible itself; which never retreats, but waits in patience and courage, inviting the most powerful onset, treating honourably both enemies and captives—who become friends.

Our sceptical readers, should we be honoured with such, as we earnestly desire, will recognize in this commencement the true Church militant style; but we trust they will meet with no intentional discourtesy; and discover here no exhibition of enmity, nor mere trial of skill, but honest, honourable and friendly contests for that highest victory—the discovery of truth,—the best friend to all parties.

It is a great mistake for a man to regard the Bible as the enemy of mankind: it defines, enforces and tends to secure all human rights, all forms of duty and freedom; and offers higher rights than belong to this world.

If the Bible be false, it is a combination of very wise and benevolent mistakes: but its chief wounds have been received in the house of its friends, who have too often betrayed it to the misdirected hostility of men, by perverting its principles and forging its authority for human schemes of delusion and oppression. The sceptic who rejects and argues against Christianity, on the ground of these human additions and misrepresentations, falls into a very natural mistake; but on reflection will perceive that IT IS UNFAIR TOWARDS ANY SYSTEM TO REJECT IT IN THEORY, BECAUSE OTHERS HAVE REJECTED IT IN PRACTICE. See for yourselves, what Christianity is; and accept or reject it on its own account. If its principles are unjust, unfair, or impure, then give it up: but if it be honest,

truthful, just, ennobling; then let it be true, though all its professors should be liars.

It can be to no person's real interest, to believe the Bible, if it be false; and certainly to no one's interest to reject it, if it be true.

All the disbelief in the world, is no disproof; and if all men should become infidels, (a very unlikely thing,) it would be no demonstration to vote the Bible out of the world. Truth is truth after all, whatever we think: and therefore it is but *fair and honest to ourselves*, to give it a proper trial, without partiality and without prejudice.

If then you find in the world under the name of religion, what you on good grounds regard as wrong; see if the Bible does not condemn it, as much as you do: and if in the Bible (as in the Old Testament,) you meet with examples of great failings; enquire further whether the Bible itself does not reprove them: *distinguish honestly between history and precept*. If in the Jewish system or history, you find something repugnant to our present views; enquire if it be not an imperfect system both of principles and practices, accommodated to those times, but abolished by Christianity. Judge the Bible like any other book; *by reading fairly on to the end*, to see its last, fullest, and clearest statements.

All this, is only what candour requires, and candour in enquiry after truth, is only doing justice to ourselves.

No one can be a fair judge of this controversy, who has not paid some attention to the nature and evidences of Christianity: some advance as arguments against the gospel, those very things which the gospel and many Christians equally condemn: this is beating the air.

The unbeliever may no doubt discover much bigotry, warmth and bitterness in defences of religion; but if he be a wise man, he will enquire whether that be a part of religion itself; and if, as he must, he discovers that this conduct is prohibited, he will condemn the advocate, but respect the cause.

Nor should it be forgotten, that dogmatism, fierceness, vituperation, wholesale invective, and misrepresentation, *are not all on one side*;—that some bitter specimens, as well as coarse, could be selected from the infidel press: happily these things belong to neither side, as to the questions at issue; and the sceptic's good sense will not at least object to the Christian command of "meekness" in opposing error; nor to the prohibition, render not evil for evil, railing for railing; nor to the example,—*"being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it: being defamed, we intreat."*—(1 Cor. iv. 12, 13.)

If any (as unhappily has been the case) have reversed this, and turned persecutors in Christ's name—the answer is, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are you?"—tyrants and lying imposters; to whom Christ will say—"depart from me, I never knew you."

Whether the principles of reasonable, candid, and dispassionate investigation here laid down, are exemplified in our contemporaries of the Infidel Press,—publications openly repudiating Christianity—the impartial reader will have an opportunity of judging in these pages.

If these qualities of earnest, high-souled love of truth, apart from accidents and prejudice, might justly be looked for anywhere, it would be in an organ *nominally* devoted to Free-thinking: especially in the first num-

ber we might expect that some great leading principles, or methods of enquiry would be unfolded : and that the freedom of thought would be seen in the absence of prejudice.

Every honest free-thinker will be ashamed of the specimen here aduced. The leading Article is headed, "a glance at the present state of theology," which indeed is not the Bible ; for "theology" is a name for a human science, professedly founded on Revelation. And as theology is thus beside the mark, so the Article itself is beside theology, and deals with another question.

The first point noticed in the "state of theology," is "the stirring up of heaven and earth *almost*, in the endeavour to make converts, by sectarians of every denomination." But this excitement is hopefully regarded as "not necessarily" a sign of vitality and progress : on the contrary, "the noise *may* be that of disruption,—the throes of dissolution." This, instead of being an estimate of opinions, is a party-coloured account of the state of parties : with which the truth of opinions, theological or otherwise, is in no way connected.

The sentence we have quoted, is strangely followed by the assertion, that "it is a bad sign for any system of religion when it requires the arm of the law to support its own want of energy, especially if it carps at *its* decisions when they chance to be adverse to *its* views." Many a free-thinking Christian has learned all this from the Bible ; but what has it to do with "the state of theology," or with the efforts of sects to gain converts ? And how can a *system of religion carp*, because *its views* are opposed ? The "*views*" make up "the system." The writer has here strangely mixed together,—efforts at conversion, Puseyism and State-Churchism, as states of theology, on the ground of which he insinuates against Christianity, which is neither theology, State-Churchism nor Puseyism. And continues to observe, "if the present system of theology be fallacious, its friends can *gain nothing* by appealing to the State for support." By "the present system of theology," he intends religion in general ; otherwise he should have said, the *systems*, for they are various ; and the best repudiate all State policy ; whilst the friends of other systems, *do gain something* by the State, namely rich livings.

"The last few years (we are soon after told) have been remarkable for the march of intellect in the *theological* world," namely in the Catholic Emancipation Bill ; which again was a political affair, not theological. This march of theology was followed by "a sop in the pan," in the shape of a grant to Maynooth ; but at this point Episcopacy, Methodism, Dissent, in all shapes and forms, *let loose the dogs of war*. Government is *cowed*, Catholicism is silent. Then the belligerent sects, not satisfied with mere *victory*, again attempt to revive against them (*i.e.* the Catholics) as extensive a *crusade* as the intelligence of the nineteenth century will "tolerate." Surely writers on the state either of parties, theology or religion, should know something of their subject. Nearly every sentence in the above is a mistake : "the dogs of war let loose" on the Catholics, were *arguments* ;—from churchmen against endowing a religion which the State had condemned by endowing Protestantism ; and arguments from dissenters *against endowing any religion at all* : nor was the Government "cowed," or sectarianism "victor" in that strife ; since the College of Maynooth *was* endowed.

The addition of a *crusade* to this "victory," is equally false; for no other weapons were employed against Catholics by "the belligerent sects," than argument from God's word:—the *crusades were not arguments*.

"The present state of Theology" is further brightened up, by the fact that these sects though united against the Catholics, are divided against each other; which is one of "the threatening symptoms that *prognosticate the demolition of their systems*." This is further ensured, by the divisions in the Church itself! But can the free-thinker seriously suppose that the separation of Church and State prognosticated by attacks on the Establishment, and by divisions in it,—that this would demolish their systems;—destroy dissent and episcopacy outright? *Has it done so in America?* Did it do so before Church and State were tied together? No! The separation would be the renovation of the Church; and remove many obstructions to the progress of religion in its various sects.

Another sign of the times, "is the splitting of *sections* in theological bodies, which causes the enunciation of *principles of progress*, and secures the advocacy of men, who as martyrs and persons who have sacrificed their interests to their convictions, must give weight to such opinions as they hold:—*such men as Newman, Froude and Foxton, who hold and avow the opinions they do, must strengthen the cause of free thought.*"

Yes, these are the men, dreaming between superstition and credulity; of weak judgments, and powerful imaginations—these are the champions of free thought!"

Why does the writer forget the brother of Newman, gone from the same sect to Rome, whither the free-minded, amiable, but feeble sceptic may yet go? Why not enumerate the wholesale perversions of such clergy to Rome? Why again overlook, such as Noel and Dodson, converted to dissent, strengthened in religion while leaving the Establishment? &c. &c. These and such like matters, would not have been *in keeping* with this triumphant dream of "progress." Was he ignorant of these, if so, he should not write on the "state of theology;" if he knew them, he should have given the real state of matters.

This review of "the present state &c.," is concluded by a view of the Annual May Meetings—"In fact, cash up, is the Alpha and Omega of these meetings. To call them annual discussions is a farce. They are, more properly speaking, annual benefits; principal performers, Messrs. Plumtre, Peto, and Cowan,—deduct the three, and the meetings would be dumb." Does not our free-thinker know as little of Exeter Hall, &c. as of "the state of theology?" He might have filled two or three pages with the names of speakers: yet he says there were only three. He carefully overlooks any meetings whose purpose *would have allied religion with freedom*—which belongs only to free-thinking. And besides this omission, he seeks to damage by false representation the societies he mentions. One great charge is brought against the Bible Society,—starving its workmen. But first, the writer should have proved the charge, and secondly, should *have found* IN THE BIBLE, a command to "grind the faces of the poor." "Behold the hire of the labourers (who have reaped down your fields,) which is if you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them that have reaped, have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth."—"The rust (of your gold and silver) shall eat into

your flesh like fire.”—(James v.) It would have been only candid to have intimated that whatever the Bible Society may do, by way of (supposed or real) injury to binders, the Bible is not to be thereby brought into prejudice. But this honest truth would give Christianity too great an advantage—the purpose was not justice or eulogy, but libel.

One important feature of prosperity, is mentioned only to prevent its proper influence,—for though the *Church Missionary Society* was “a taking affair,” the subscriptions exceeding £94,000, still do not be alarmed, for some of it was from legacies “which from the spirit of intelligence now abroad, is *likely* to prove in future years not so prolific.”

Why all this special pleading and anxiety in the Free-thinker’s oracle to depreciate, damage and diminish, the appearance of living Christianity?

The concluding observations explain all this:—“the result, so far as Christianity is concerned, is *damning evidence* of the futility of the attempt to deceive man many years longer.”—“the antiquated systems will not much longer hold water.”

This is not “damning evidence” so far as Christianity is concerned, but so far as the fairness and honesty of the free-thinker is concerned.

What vast jumps, from the bishop of Exeter to Exeter Hall, and from thence to the falsehood of Christianity!

Surely it was a conclusion arrived at beforehand, to be supported by irrelevant matters, a slight and entirely mistaken review not of the Bible, but of the Puseyite controversy and the May meetings! Religion must be very strong, if this be all that can be mustered against it, in the opening article of a Free-thinker.

Let the readers of that paper at least look for two qualities, knowledge and truthfulness; and not be cheated by this slight, hasty and prejudiced view of things; but employ their own good sense in reading the Bible, and exhibit their own shrewdness as to fair dealing, in demanding an honest investigation, instead of hints, hearsay, mistake and insinuation. After these palpable blunders, the writer concludes that Christianity is an abortive attempt to deceive man:—and this he proves by the abortive attempt at identifying all the above questions with Christianity; and calling the whole priestcraft. “Deceit (he tells us however) and intolerance have only to be known to excite the hostility of mankind. Such is *priestcraft*, a system that has connived at and co-operated with tyranny of every form; that *has suppressed intellect, set man against man, and nation against nation*; that has made religion to consist of forms and symbols, instead of practical goodness: in fact, priestcraft has been the blight, that has made a desert of the human family.” No doubt priestcraft is bad enough, but to write thus about *benevolent* societies, the Tract, Bible, and Missionary Societies,—that these are to “set man against man, and nation against nation;” or that *Christianity* is doing this—and all without any proof, or pretence of regular argument, is simply a disgrace to the name Free-thinker’s Magazine.

The whole article, is not free-thinking, but free libelling; an attempt to deceive and entrap the reader.

We will trouble our readers with but one other specimen from their first article: speaking of the Tract Society, we are told,—“the said society had published, since their (its) commencement, five hundred millions

of what they are pleased to term little messengers of mercy ; by which they mean, those little specimens of bad paper, bad printing, and *worse orthography*, that are hawked about from house to house, *by a certain class of people* who, *being miserable themselves, want to make every body else so*, and the *burden of the contents of which* may be summed up in admonitions to children not to buy lollypops on Sunday, and by not allowing them any halfpence in their pockets [It is not said whether the Tracts extract the halfpence] they manage [*who manages?*] to make them withstand the temptation."

This is a very summary way of summing up, and dismissing in a paragraph, a society of such vast operations and benevolent efforts : there is a smartness about it, that indicates an easy way of thinking and settling matters : unfortunately, the summary is a bare untruth in every single assertion ; whether its laboured wit, will atone for its palpable falsehood ; is a matter for graver consideration.

Certainly children will not want intellectual lollypops, while such free-thinking manufacture is vended ; but is this the food for *men*,—who would *think* as well as laugh, who do not object to be tickled, but would rather not be bamboozled out of common sense ?

Happiness is a matter of taste perhaps, but who told this writer that distributors of tracts were miserable ; and further, that they were desirous of making others so ? Perhaps he was joking : well call it then the joker's magazine,—a very heavy Punch ; but we do not put up a false name, and call it *thinking*. Besides, we like a joke very much, only in sober earnest do not see why both jokes and invectives of bitterness and slander should be all the portion of serious people. We may then, in joke, ask our facetiously thinking friend, if he have *read* the five hundred million little messengers, and formed an abstract of their "*burden*," whether he have carefully read even a thousand, or one dozen, or even one tract ? And whether if *one*, it was the "lollypop" heading that attracted attention. If the Free-thinker seriously meant what he said, on good evidence of experience or on that of a brother thinker, (for no Christian would give such an account,) if then this be declared from experience or fraternal testimony, the writer, or his informant, is the best read man in her Majesty's dominions, though his reading, like his leading article, must have been miscellaneous.

We pass over an article properly termed a "brief *glance* at politics," to consider another theological article, headed, "The Genuine Gibbon." "A reprint of those portions of the famous historian that *Christians* consider it to be *their duty to suppress*, in order that doubts may not be raised as to the *infallibility* of divine revelation." These words are printed in capitals, and contain two capital mistakes ; first, it is *presumed* that "Christians," *i. e.* the great body of them, (for it does not say some, or few) are anxiously engaged to suppress part of Gibbon's History. It happens that more than one half of Christians do not know who Gibbon is : and that no Christian has ever aimed at the suppression of Gibbon's work ; but a publisher has endeavoured to meet the wants of some, who willing to allow their children to read Gibbon's History, may also be desirous of preventing their indiscriminate reading (before the maturity of their judgment) what they may very innocently read afterwards.

And so far from this being a desire to suppress or annihilate and cause to be forgotten, any part of Gibbon, THE OMISSIONS ARE INDIRECTLY OR DIRECTLY ACKNOWLEDGED: since the edition complained of, is called "The Family Gibbon;" telling even half-witted people, that there is another Gibbon; therefore it is not suppression, but SELECTION or abridgment: and surely people either in business or in families have that free-thinking liberty to read, admit or omit, what parts they like.

First then, "Christians" as such and in general, are not concerned in this edition of Gibbon; nor is it a suppression, but *an acknowledged selection*. This attempt to *save* Gibbon, will only *expose* the free-thinker, as a clumsy and illiberal alarmist.

Secondly, be it observed, that the omitted parts of Gibbon (Chap. xv.) HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH THE INFALLIBILITY OF DIVINE REVELATION; but with the history of the early spread of Christianity: and *a man may be a very orthodox Christian, yet believe every word of Gibbon's History* about the secondary causes of the early spread of the gospel.

And now since the Free-thinker has been so generous as to save Gibbon from those who "use their might against free discussion: whose arguments consist of abuse and calumny," it will perhaps be found that *the same love of fair play, will also insert Mr. Davis's answer to Gibbon's fifteenth Chapter*; an answer which more than anything in Mr. Gibbon's life disturbed his philosophical equanimity.

It is really pleasant to find so safe an immortality for Gibbon's remains in the Free-thinker—"it becomes an important duty not to allow these *forbidden* portions of great authors to die out;" "to prevent this result," the Free-thinker has embalmed the persecuted chapter in his own secure pages: but *what if the Free-thinker should die out also?* Where will Gibbon be then? Where he is now, in the hands of most reading men, although they be Christians. So that this alarm for Gibbon, is a very ill conceived scheme to deceive people into the belief that Christians are mean, cowardly, and deceitful. It all recoils upon the Free-thinker. We shall occasionally look into his pages again, to see what other works he saves from dying out: giving him meanwhile, this advice,—to use arguments instead of artifices.

These rebukes of unfairness and illiberality, should fall with the greater severity upon writers who are perpetually stigmatizing believers:—neither arguing candidly against Christianity nor treating Christians with common decency: every article on these subjects in the first number, abounds with these bad manners: even a letter on "divorce," must assert, that sensible men on other subjects, "when under ecclesiastical influence, become silly, unreflecting, illogical, impatient, illiberal, unjust, and bigoted. In fact, on theological subjects, *some men are insane.*" The writer does not say *which* men, or he might account for this excess of abuse.

The Review department exhibits great anger at Messrs. Chambers, because of some deference to the religious public,—especially since the editor of a paper on the Bonaparte family, "has not mind enough to see any good whatever in those who *fight their way to greatness* from amongst the ranks of the people; this *rancorous* feeling [against *mild fighting greatness*] is evidenced throughout." As an evidence of a better feeling,

the review ends with the *assurance*, that "the book itself and the publishers deserve approbation and support; and they [the book and publishers?] may rest assured they would be *safer* in writing and publishing for the great body of the people, [for whom else do Chambers publish?] than in *pandering to the prejudices of an interested, bigoted, and sectarian minority.*"

This is liberal free-thinking, which trembles to have a select Gibbon, but wishes to exclude moral estimates of character from all writings for "the great body of the people," that is, free-thinkers; whilst Christians are simply a bigoted and interested minority, who should be liberally abused.

We hope to meet with better specimens both of temper and reasoning in our contemporaries of the Infidel Press.

The second number of the Free-thinker's organ, pursues the same course, descending almost beneath criticism, and requiring little more than to quote specimens which condemn themselves. It commences with another "glance at the present state of theology," and goes on the supposition that men's conduct and the state of parties, are theology; and concludes from this mistake, that the Bible is a cheat.

Whoever else may be saved, professing Christians have no mercy at the free-thinker's hands. "Indifference to worldly matters is their profession." [they profess no such thing.] "Solicitude respecting them in a more than ordinary average is their practice." Godliness and gain are the most taking articles of the creed." [*Whose creed?*]

"If masters, they are tyrants; if magistrates, professors are the most bigoted and brutal; as legislators they stand first in suppressing the rights and liberties of their fellow men, &c. Yet, free-thinkers are told it proves nothing to show up the misdeeds of professors of religion,—that the hand of God is working beneath it all—fudge. *By what shall we judge a system, if not by its fruits?*" Undoubtedly friend, its fruits are the criterion; BUT HOW CAN THOSE ACTIONS BE THE FRUITS OF A SYSTEM, *when the actors ONLY PROFESS but DO NOT PRACTICE the system?* You yourself allow that these men have Christ only as a "nominal master;" then what has their nominal Christianity to do with real Christianity? These questions of course will never be answered; but an impartial judge will take a note of them.

The trial by the fruits, should be applied to professors, not to religion; "by their fruits shall ye know them;" and if their works deny the gospel, it is no reason for condemning the gospel, but for condemning *them*.

Our Free-thinker is awkwardly conscious of this mistake, and so labours to hide it, or to becloud the reader, by a more vehement accusation of Christians, and raking up even Acts of Parliament on the Sabbath, and Education, to throw at Christianity: but is the gospel concerned in Acts of Parliament? The readers of the Free-thinker are beginning to see through this obvious mistake; and hence in reply to a correspondent, the editor has to "beg to say if he will continue to read the magazine, he shall have ample demonstration that we have *more valid reasons* for *endeavouring* to uproot *what is called Christianity*, than the turpitude of its professors." Now it happens that this turpitude of professors, is no valid reason at all, unless the writer will shew that these professors

practice Christianity: but whilst they practice something else, what has religion to do with those *who have denied the faith, and are worse than infidels*?—(1 Tim. 5—8.)

All these objections therefore lie not against Christians, but against hypocrites: and when bad sovereigns shew the worthlessness of good ones, hypocrites will disprove Christianity.

Let the writer find in the gospel, a command or excuse for the practices he condemns, and till then, find fault with professors; but be silent at least, about the gospel;—till it is proved guilty.

What is it to me, though Judas was a thief, am I therefore also to betray Christ because Judas did?

Only one short paragraph, denying responsibility for belief, touches upon any real objection to the Bible; and that paragraph is merely assertion, whilst the subject requires fair, full, and honest investigation.

But this metaphysical question, is soon abandoned for vituperation and falsehood: after vilifying believers, the writer vilifies the Bible, to prepare for such a precious saying as this—"WE HATE THE BIBLE," we have a "*contempt* for the professors of religion." Now it happens that all lying priests who aspire to power, wealth, and lordship, like free-thinkers, also "*hate the Bible*." Every one who knows anything of the Bible, knows it condemns priestcraft; priests put Christ to death; and have often put his followers to death: and all who know anything of liberty, know that in the rampant ages of priestly rule, *the Bible was carefully hidden*: men were murdered for translating it: and still in the face of these facts, the Free-thinker utters the following:—"This Bible, because *it served the turn* of the priests in the barbarous ages [priests, who carefully suppressed it!] because it allied itself with power [another falsehood] which in the middle ages, meant the strongest and most unscrupulous free-booter, who, the people were taught by the same book [WHERE?] to consider, were imbued with a *divine right* [a priestly invention again, as well as free-thinking libel] to trample on mankind; and to be sacrificed or slaughtered according to the will and pleasure of this *priest-made* sacred thief, is still endeavoured, by persuasions of all kinds, by threats, by force of law, to be thrust down our throats whether we will or no."

When the writer of this sentence can shew us what the Bible has to do, either with such practices, or such priests; when he can find *threats in Christianity on the subject*,—then he will state them, referring to chapter and verse: and meanwhile, he rests under the imputation of uttering some wild, if not wicked, because false assertions.

It is the easiest and simplest thing in the world, to read the history, precepts, and general doctrines of the Redeemer; and if he or his recognized Apostles, were the allies of a blood-thirsty despotism, this can be shewn out of the New Testament. But if it be found that they were the victims of oppression; that they preached and exhibited love, peace, brotherhood; then it is plain that these who think differently are deniers of Christ, and misrepresent his system, as much as the free-thinker does.

It is of a piece with this falsification of history and the Bible, to mix up the Metropolitan Interments Bill, with the state of theology and the truth of Christianity. The shameful conduct of the dominant Church, in thus *taxing the dead*, is just as honourable as the free-thinker's artifice in *taxing Christianity* with the robbery of graves.

"The tactics of the clergy respecting the Metropolitan Interments Bill, is of the usual kind: . . . in one parish, as proved by Sir B. Hall, (and in many others it is the same,) the burial-grounds belonging to the parish, were purchased by the parish; yet the cormorant who holds the living, that of St. Giles, value £900 and odd *per annum*, with a dean'ship, value £1,000, is to have a perpetual annuity—a tax upon the dead—struck upon an average of the burials in that churchyard for five years: but as believers would pay, 'it is all working together for good.' The good we see in it, is that nations will rise up and sweep away for ever the crude *religious* systems that have cursed the earth."

It happens that no believers would use that passage in the above style; though it be a truth, that evils by overdoing themselves get intolerable: and further, many believers would sweep away this system which is **NOT RELIGIOUS**, but **POLITICAL**, and no part of Christianity. Undoubtedly it is a shame, that we cannot have cemeteries outside of towns, without paying toll at the dead house, to clergymen; but what has this to do with the purity or truth of religion? *Let free-thinkers reckon with Parliament for that*,—it is no sacrament of Christ's religion.

From this burlesque of Christianity, the writer concludes, "it is all of a piece; unwholesome, putrid, and must be removed—in its place must be reared a system of pure morality; we must live it, all men must be priests of it, all must be equal in it." We have no objection to the removal of these abuses which disgrace religion: if men will *live that*, no such practices can exist; then all *will* be priests, "ye are a royal priesthood;" and all will be equal; for none is to exercise lordship, since we are "*all brethren*."—(Matt. xxiii. 8—11. Mark x. 42, 46.)

What has Christianity then to do with Parliamentary Acts, and Episcopal lordship?—(1 Pet. v. 2, 3.) Or in the gentle words of the Free-thinker—"what to do with *us* are the doings of the Council of Nice? What weight do *we* place on the musty deeds of stupid synods? What care *we* for what that hoary libertine, Henry VIII. believed? or that peurile idiot, Edward? or those tigresses Elizabeth and Mary?" To which we may add,—or parliament, or clergy, or bench of bishops? *Give us something against JESUS CHRIST, HE IS OUR AUTHORITY.* And to mistake the above characters for Christianity, is to deserve the title so gracefully applied to Edward.

This second number of the *Free-thinker's Magazine*, condemns itself, for from lack of matter (notwithstanding the editor seeks to fill up with abuse of Christianity, instead of fair arguments against its being abused,) we are treated, not only with a further reprint of Gibbon, but with an **ALLEGORY, BY VOLTAIRE**. That Allegory shews that Voltaire at least, could distinguish between Catholic Priestcraft and Christianity. And it is an answer to the free-thinker.

Taken in a dream into the next world, Voltaire met with several worthies; who had been the victims of persecution: he saw also the heaps of the bones of slaughtered saints: did he then conclude against Christianity? Hear him, and learn how to reason.

"Here I beheld a man (Jesus Christ) of mild and simple mien, who appeared about thirty-five years old. *He was looking with compassion* upon a distant heap of whitened skeletons, through which I had been led

to the abode of the sages. I was astonished to find his feet swelled and bloody, his hands in the same state, his side pierced, and his ribs laid bare by flogging. Good God! said I, is it possible that one of the just and wise should be in this state? I have just seen one treated in a very odious manner; but there is no comparison between his punishment and yours. *BAD priests and bad judges poisoned him* (Socrates.) Was it *also by priests and judges* that you were so cruelly assassinated? With great affability, he answered 'yes.' And who were those monsters? 'They were *hypocrites*.' [The parties by whom the Free-thinker crucifies the Son of God afresh, by denying his religion because of their hypocrisy.]

But did you say nothing, did you do nothing, that could serve them as a *pretext*? '*The wicked find a pretext in everything.*'

You did not then contribute anything by your discourses, either badly rendered, or badly interpreted, to those frightful masses of bones which I passed on my way to consult you? 'Impossible! I and mine lived in poverty and lowliness; my greatness was only in virtue.' [Then why does the Free-thinker quote A Bishop and Beadle, and the Book of Martyrs, against Christianity?]

Can we love God and eat meat on a Friday? [Asceticism.] 'I always ate what was given me; for I was too poor to give a dinner to any one.'

Might we love God and be just, and still be prudent enough not to entrust all the adventures of one's life to a person one does not know? [Confession.] 'Such was always my custom.'

Might not I, while doing good, be excused from making a pilgrimage to St. James of Compostella? [Penances, pilgrimages and Saint worship.] 'I was never in that country.'

Should I confine myself in a place of retirement with blockheads? [Monkery-Monasteries, &c.] 'I always made little journeys from town to town.'

Well if it be so [if priestly burlesque, and free-thinking slander, form no part of your system.] I TAKE YOU FOR MY ONLY MASTER.

Then he gave me a nod, which filled me with consolation. The vision disappeared, and I was left with a good conscience."

May not the free-thinker learn a lesson of truthfulness, candour and duty, from Voltaire? And may not the Redeemer say, out of thine own Magazine will I judge thee?

N.B. We are sufficiently aware that to many of our readers it is unnecessary to expose the above form of infidelity; and that they would rather see its more refined shapes and subtle arguments explained: **THESE WE SHALL CERTAINLY NOT NEGLECT IN THEIR TURN**; but since we write mainly for the working classes, we are desirous first of all to exhibit *the bolder and more popular* forms of unbelief, that plain men may be able to meet the dishonest artifices we have exposed. The free-thinkers dissected in this article, are by no means at the bottom of the scale of intellect or influence, and are far from thinking soberly of themselves: this is a virtue, however, to which we may in some degree help them.

V.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN NATURE.

The nature of man as spiritual, immortal, and responsible, will be the most frequent topic of this department: though sometimes we shall introduce MISCELLANEOUS subjects.

THE SEPARATE PROVINCES, OF PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, AND RELIGION.

“There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding;” such is the declaration of Holy Writ, and such we regard as the firmest conclusion of the highest philosophy.

It is our purpose in this department, to make manifest and vindicate this great fact of human nature;—that man consists of something distinct from the bodily organization,—a spirit, submitting to other laws than those of mechanism, chemistry and physiology; and to point out in plain language the qualities of that soul; so that our readers may know as clearly what spirit is, as some think they know what matter is.

We hope in these pages to present to all our readers a comprehensible system of their own spiritual nature, and in doing this, we shall endeavour to afford a defence of old and long recognized truths, for the present in danger of being overlooked by the influence of one of those periodical mental fashions, which are to the public mind what the skin is to those fellow creatures which occasionally at set times put on a new dress.

The only difference being, that changes of the public mind, as to a fashionable sentiment, are more gradual and infrequent; neither dependent upon nor measured by the revolutions of the sun, but resulting from other forces; and effected in varying periods.

Now we wish that like those creatures referred to, the old skin may be cast, by a process of nature, (not by the barbarous method of flaying;)—by the force of those inward currents of life, which renew the surface, and put off the old man by the gradual mastery of the new.

Amidst all the superficial changes in a civilized and to some extent Christianized country,—there is an under-current of good sense, and real life, which needs only to be fostered, in order to subordinate and overcome, everything contrary thereto. And it is to this life we appeal; to those truths and principles most surely believed by many, and never overthrown or shaken by any; that men may no longer have three or four inconsistent provinces of faith; but from a central and unquestioned position, examine the discordant materials added to their collection of indiscriminate mental curiosities.

None can believe contradictions at the same time ; but our minds are like some books ; we often contradict ourselves on the next page.

It is useful therefore to have a collation and comparison of the table of contents ; that we may see at one glance, whether the ingredients are consistent.

The main difficulty in teaching the great questions of philosophy, arises not from the abstruseness of the subjects, so much as from the technical language under which these questions have been buried : so that he who undertakes to instruct *the people* in these subjects, must first understand them so clearly, as to declare them in the vernacular tongue. Circulating his acquired capital in the current coin of the realm. As we are told respecting Demosthenes, that he buried himself in his underground study, till he had arranged his thoughts and mastered his language ; being thus prepared to *come up to*, and electrify the people ; so we want those who shall descend into the recesses and labyrinths of knowledge ; to enquire anxiously what philosophy intends to utter ; and then emerge from the gloom of study, to scatter plain and deep oracles, which will find a fitting echo, in the profundity of man's spiritual nature.

Our main purpose in this enquiry will be, to shew the **RELATION BETWEEN SCIENCE, PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION** ; that we may know on some assignable grounds, *which is to give way ; and in what province either is supreme.*

To prepare for a complete view of our subject, it is necessary then to notice, **THE THREE GRAND LEADING DIVISIONS OF KNOWLEDGE, and the professions founded on them.**

These divisions are Physics, Metaphysics, and Divinity ; or Science, Philosophy, and Theology. Physics or science, has to do with observations of outward nature ; the discovery of the orderly series of changes in material things ; these changes in their observed order, constituting the laws of nature or methods and processes in physical objects. Metaphysics, or philosophy, deals first with human consciousness, the inward laws of thought, and the relations of outward nature to intelligence. This forms a bridge between science and religion. Whilst religion deals with our moral relations to the Creator and from our relation to him and his revealed will, indicates our relations to each other.

On these three general branches of knowledge, are founded three professions ; Physiologists, in the widest sense, of professors of the natural sciences, including all subordinate branches, of astronomy, geology, chemistry, medicine, &c. Metaphysicians, dealing with intelligences and the principles on which they act. Divines, teaching human duty in relation to the Supreme Will.

Originally, these three branches of knowledge were included in one profession—the priesthood ; as the Eastern Magi, the British Druids, and for some time the miscalled Christian priesthood. And while knowledge was thus confined to a class, it was a monopoly of power ; and like all monopolies, was an engine of oppression and delusion : it was the great agent of State policy and popular superstition.

But these three elements of knowledge, have since been separated, as well as extended beyond the clerical profession. And the result was a new distribution of power ; and the priesthood either lost its influence or

acquired it on a different and more appropriate footing. Divinity once amongst the people, disenthralled their minds, and led to other results, wrapped up in the Reformation, and included in the elements of Christianity.

Science being divorced from theology, tended to scepticism, and materialism; whilst philosophy tended to re-unite science and religion, not by the influence of an ecclesiastical caste, but on the proper ground of the common principles which belong to, and illuminate both.

But the great evil in this divorce of the various elements of knowledge, consists first, in any enquirer confining himself to one branch, so as to exclude the legitimate influence of the other: and secondly, in the division of the subjects not being complete; one is allowed to enter the province of the other; thus religion has spoiled science, and science has opposed or degraded religion.

And why? Because their respective territories are not defined, and kept distinct.

Thus, in the noted instance of the sun rising and setting; a scientific man is imprisoned by ecclesiastics, for denying this: wherein is the mistake? plainly in its being a question of science, not of religion; therefore no theory of astronomy can oppose the Bible, which is not a treatise on astronomy; but on the gravitation of souls, around the Father of lights. If then the question be scientific, the Bible does not pretend to touch it; if the question be religious or spiritual, science cannot reach it: the two can never clash, but in the minds of the ignorant or presumptuous. If the question is not spiritual, the Bible is not concerned in it; but speaks according to obvious appearance and common apprehension, as is suited to the language of daily life: but if the question be spiritual, it is beyond science; and the Bible will not speak according to appearance and general opinion, but against both, and according to realities.

Wherein then lies the usual mistake on this question? It is in obtruding into another line of things, to which their province does not extend: as for instance, in the two classes of natural enquirers, those who examine the physiology of man, and those who investigate external nature. The enquirers into Nature, having acquired no loftier leading principles from consciousness and reflection, will see only a series of physical changes, the order of which they will turn into a LAW, AND DEIFY EFFECTS;—making the order of succession, its own cause and explanation; and thus shutting out the universal worker. *They will account for watches, by the order of watchmaking—the laws of mechanics; and overlook the mechanic himself.*

Whilst those who examine man's frame anatomically, *will forget the man and see only his frame*; passing by all that higher series of phenomena, of intellect and affection, and those obvious general principles of providence, which add to the materialism and atheism of science, the spirit of man, and that God who is a Spirit:—two grand subjects which humanly, are the province of philosophy; divinely, the province of revelation.

Now spiritual enquiries are undoubtedly the highest, and the most certain; whilst indeed, a spirit carries them on: and they are the

most certain, because we know ourselves, our feelings, and thoughts first; and all we know of material things, is their effects on our minds, and their subserviency to our efforts. Nay, the highest forms of demonstration, belong to thoughts, and not to material things: as in mathematics, where we reason upon the perfection of our ideas; and not upon any external realities; for there are no triangles, squares nor circles in nature.

This being the case, must we abandon natural enquiries? No: but not become so exclusively absorbed in them as to be *buried in the grave of physics*, and blind to the soul which carries on all our enquiries; but ascend to that higher point of philosophy, which teaches the true relation and subordinate character of material things. Let then first, each province of enquiry be distinct; and secondly, let their true relations to each other, and connexion by universal principles be examined. As in language, we carefully distinguish each, and even its dialects; and next, as the highest form of philosophical or comparative grammar, discover their fundamental affinities.

So we should study the various branches of knowledge, know the limits of their province, by a clear separation; and then unite them again, not in a separate priesthood, but in the general liberal education of all men.

Indeed it would be a vast improvement in our educational methods, if we could have collected a general view of the settled principles of each science, apart from its details, as the outline or general map, in which the relation of all the provinces to the Metropolis should first be learned; after which, we might settle down for life, in which department we please, but ever remember the outline of geography,—the relation of our chosen province to the surrounding ones.

But till this be done, so long as science and literature are divorced from philosophy and religion, the *lovers* of Religion are bound to enter the arena of science, to point out its spiritual deficiency, and lead the wise men to the feet of Christ.

One great and legitimate use of science in relation to religion, is to find illustrations and analogies; as in Bishop Butler's Analogy; in Pritchard's Natural History of Man, shewing the oneness of the human race; Dr. Wiseman's Lectures on Science and Revealed Religion; together with those philological enquiries which tend to prove a unity of language, amidst superficial varieties.

Thus far we have enquired into the relation of the various branches of knowledge; and find that physics can neither settle metaphysics nor divinity; if therefore we find physiology in any form, on the low ground of physical agency, obtruding into philosophy, opposing its settled principles of mind and morals; obstructing the known methods of education, and contradicting the essentials of religion, it is plain that this pretended science, is opposed to truth, and hostile to the best interests of humanity.

There is an obvious but mistaken objection which may be made to this line of reasoning; namely, that if science and religion are to be kept distinct, religion should not come out of its place to settle the science of physiology. But we reply, it does not come out of its place; it vindicates its own province, and shews that physiology has blindly and boldly invaded both philosophy and religion.

"What cheer" enquires Emerson, "can the religious sentiment yield, when that is suspected to be secretly dependent on the seasons of the year, and the state of the blood?" No doubt a religion of mere sentimentality and bodily feeling, depends upon the health of the body, and the fineness of the day; when sickness comes, or the day is clouded, this sentiment evaporates; but a religion of truth, is independent of weather and organization, sunshine and health; and is stronger in the dark days of adversity, in the weakness and dissolution of nature; for as the outward man decays, the inward man is renewed day by day.

"I knew" says Emerson, "a witty physician, who found theology in the biliary duct, and used to affirm, that if there was a disease in the liver, the man became a Calvinist, but if that organ was sound, he became a Unitarian."

This is as good as the gentleman mentioned by Carlisle, who whilst believing that the brain secreted thought, regarded poetry and religion as the production of the smaller intestines.

"On the platform of physics," says Emerson, "we cannot resist the contracting influence of so-called science. I know the mental proclivity of physicians. I hear the chuckle of phrenologists. Theoretic kidnappers and slave-drivers, they esteem each man the victim of another, who winds him round his finger, by knowing the law of his being, and by such cheap sign-boards as the colour of his beard, or the slope of his occiput, reads the inventory of his fortunes and character. The grossest ignorance, does not disgust like this impudent knowingness. The physicians say they are not materialists; but they are:—Spirit is matter reduced to an extreme thinness: *O so thin!* What notions do they attach to love! what to religion! One would not willingly pronounce these words in their hearing, and give them the occasion to profane them.

"I saw a gracious gentleman who adapts his conversation to the form of the head of the man he talks with! I had thought that the value of life, lay in its inscrutable possibilities; shall I preclude my future, by taking a high seat, and kindly adapting my conversation to the shape of heads? When I come to that, the doctors shall buy me for a cent. 'But Sir, medical history; the report of the institute; the proven facts!'—I distrust the facts and the inferences." [Essay on Experience.]

The logical instruments of definition and division, are the practical instruments of life—social, commercial, political, and ecclesiastical.

The great question of this and of all ages, is to define the proper department of persons and systems.

The term "Lawyer" must stand to us for a definite business, that all may know what they are to expect from the profession. "Parliament," or "Legislation" in like manner, must have its prescribed boundaries, settled by enlightened reason; that we may know what is its appropriate province. Some of the greatest evils of society, have resulted from overstepping the true boundary, and interfering in matters of commerce and religion. Therefore we have to retrace our steps, and confine civil government to its proper business. "Every one to his last."

If no such divisions of labour existed, the "signs" over our merchants', manufacturers', or salemen's establishments; would be no real signs,—having no definite significations. We should always be mystified, and not

know where to apply for whatever was required. Now the same distinctness is necessary as to the provinces of philosophy, science, and religion;—to know “the length of our line,”—not merely the extent of our powers, but the legitimate direction for enquiry on any subject.

The applications of the distinction we have imperfectly defined in this introductory article, are numerous and important, as will be seen in our subsequent enquiries.

For the present, it is enough to point out by the help of this light, a fallacy advanced with much parade, by Mr. George Combe, on “the relation between science and Scripture.”* He remarks, that “Galileo was told from high authority in the Church, that his doctrine of the revolution of the globe was *at variance with Scripture*, and that therefore it could not be true; but as his opinions were founded on facts, they prevailed. If there had been a real opposition between Scripture and Nature, the only result would have been a demonstration that Scripture in this particular *was erroneously interpreted*. If any fact in physiology, does actually and directly contradict any interpretation of Scripture, it is not difficult to perceive which must yield.”

This quotation and our present argument, are independent of any peculiar physiological system entertained by Mr. Combe; being simply an instance of a general principle.

The mistake of this author, consists in forgetting the proper provinces of science and Scripture, which never can in any way be opposed. For the Bible, being *a work on salvation and not on astronomy*, has nothing to do with scientific discoveries, but speaks in popular language, as our present secular books, of the sun “rising and setting.”

The Bible did not contradict Galileo, it did not pretend to give any opinion on the matter: any more than a modern almanac, which tells when the sun rises and sets: and no discoveries in astronomy can *alter the interpretation of those words*.

But if astronomy be turned into astrology, and pretend to predict that men will not appear before the judgment seat of Christ,—we are not therefore to alter our interpretations of the Bible; but to examine the pretensions of astrologers.

No one has ever altered the interpretation of the Scriptures, to suit Galileo's science; and we think no one will venture upon that, to suit any advancement of physiology, which is a question of the body, whilst the Bible deals only with the soul.

Science therefore, must be taught its own place, and warned to keep it;—the observation and record of physical facts. The nature and value of philosophy, in its own distinctive province,—reflection on mental laws and enlarged inferences from the physical facts observed and arranged by science,—will form the subject of our next investigation.

Science, is the observation and orderly arrangement of material changes:—a matter chiefly of the senses and memory: philosophy regards the nature of man, and the wisdom exhibited in the arrangements of nature, discovered by science;—exclusively a matter of reflection and reasoning. Religion regards the claims of God on man, and his provisions of mercy for man;—which as to all practical purposes, is a matter of divine authority,

* Constitution of Man. Chap. ix.

proved by evidences, as to its origin, and suitableness: and appealing to man as capable of homage and duty, or reason in relation to moral questions, sometimes called CONSCIENCE. So that we hope the distinction is plain, and in general terms may thus be expressed,—THE PROVINCE OF SCIENCE IS CHIEFLY THE SENSES; THAT OF PHILOSOPHY, IS THE REASON; THAT OF RELIGION, IS IN THE CONSCIENCE: giving us, physical facts, intellectual conclusions, moral obligations.

REVIEWS AND CRITICISMS.

“Christianity in harmony with man's nature, present and progressive. Seven Lectures preached in Gallowtree Gate Chapel, Leicester.”
Published by request. By the Rev. GEORGE LEGGE, LL.D.
London: J. SNOW.

This work like the system whose philosophy it unfolds is suited to all ages. It is a lucid, argumentative and eloquent exhibition of the adaptation of the word of God to, the soul of man. We are glad to observe that the author “has something else in his mind, of the same sort, but on a more extensive scale, and of a more ambitious aim.” Meanwhile we hail this, as a pledge of something more considerable, and earnestly commend it to the thoughtful study of our readers.

The following are the topics of the seven Lectures.

1. Christianity in harmony with man as an intellectual being.—2. With man as an imaginal being.—3. As a moral being.—4. The same continued.—5. With man as a social being.—6. As a progressional being.—7. With man's whole being and hope.

The idea is complete, and well carried out; furnishing us with another proof of the truth of the gospel, derived from its value and suitableness.

In the first Lecture, we notice one incidental statement, which if properly carried out, would prove an important principle in many doctrinal speculations: viz.: “that our safest plan is to conceive of the revelation given to us, as a revelation *not of God in the absolute, but of God in accommodation to our need.*”

Christianity came for practitioners, rather than for mere philosophers; it tells what God does, rather than what he is; and explains the relation of the Divine Being to the recovery of sinful man.

A very important suggestion is made in the same lecture, by which much modern mysticism (a cover either for rationalism or for superstition, which are closely allied) is pierced through; for whereas men have juggled with the terms “logical and intuitional consciousness,” or “understanding and reason,” it is clearly intimated, that (as we have long believed) *these are only operations of the same faculty on different subjects.*

The difference lies (as the logicians would say) in the nature of the “subject matter,” not in the faculties of mind employed. It is nothing more than the old division of “contingent and necessary truths.”

Accordingly Dr. Legge observes, “I do not see that anything is gained, by referring these beliefs to different faculties of mind.”

Our space forbids us to give specimens bearing more directly on the main object; but we gladly introduce the work to the notice of our readers.

Rimini and Oxford; or, the Miraculous picture of Mary, and a Divine Portrait of the Church. Dedicated without permission to Pius IX. By the Rev. BREWIN GRANT, B.A., Minister of Highbury Chapel, Birmingham. Published by request. London: Ward and Co.

On this Pamphlet the *Birmingham Journal* observes—"The wondrous works attributed to the canvass of Rimini, and the adoration paid to that winking piece of art, are the foundation for an exposure of the fallacies of saint and virgin worship, in which considerable erudition and force of logic are employed.

In "The ONE TRUE Church," is discussed, a question intrinsically important, but seldom handled. Mr. Grant brings to the consideration of this subject, temper and discrimination."

The *Birmingham Mercury*, (in a review extending to a column and a half,) says—It cannot be denied that during the last twenty years, since the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act, the adherents of the Church of Rome have been indefatigable in their efforts to promote the advancement of their faith in this country, and it must be admitted that they have been tolerably successful, having increased from the possession of one hundred places of worship at that time, to six hundred at the present. Such a development of numbers has led to a bolder development of the Romish system in some of its most peculiar features, in reference to the orders and institutions of monks, nuns, monasteries, convents, jesuits, abbots, friars, &c., which so abounded in the middle or dark ages, and to which these re-introductions are designed to throw us back. Now the best way to prevent such a state of things, and to maintain the light of Protestant truth, is to imitate the conduct of Mr. Grant—not to propose legislative restrictions upon the Romanists, with regard to the development of their system, but to make such an examination and refutation of their doctrines, principles and practices, as shall render such "development" useless and unnecessary.

Mr. Grant has taken advantage of the seasonable opportunity of exposing, in the most masterly and effective manner, the recent imposture of the "winking Virgin" of Rimini, sanctioned by the clergy of Rome and the Pope himself, who gave orders for the coronation of the picture, on account of its alleged "winking" propensities.

Passing from the this subject, (of the winking Picture,) Mr. Grant goes on to the root of the matter, the divine and immaculate honour ascribed to the Virgin Mary, and the worship paid to her by the Church of Rome.

I.

CHRIST'S RELIGION.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD." 1 Thess. v. 21.

THE INSCRIPTION ON THE CROSS: ITS LANGUAGES AND THEIR LESSONS.

THE GRAND CENTRAL FACT in the history of this world, is THE CRUCIFIXION of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Prophecy directed the hopes of men onward to it; history directs their faith to the same central point. The importance of the event, and the peculiarities by which it was accompanied, are worthy the attention of thinking men, even merely as scholars interested in human history; whether sceptics or believers.

Whilst further, the circumstance we have now to examine, together with its tacit allusions, or parallels naturally suggested,—will serve as a fitting framework in which to embody an enlarged lesson respecting *the nature and evidences of the gospel itself*.

The subject is so great and manifold, touching upon so many various lines of knowledge, that we willingly reserve to ourselves the privilege of recurring again (in the same medium) to this important enquiry; in order to make up for the inevitable deficiencies of our first examination.

Indeed the topics here furnished or suggested, might well and profitably engage a life-time; and demand for their adequate exhibition the ripest scholarship, and deepest thoughts of a great and sanctified intellect.

In attempting so great a theme therefore, honesty of intention, must be our apology for the boldness of the undertaking; especially as we do not profess to do more than to throw out such suggestions as may be completed by abler hands: whilst we are content to deduce a few plain lessons for plain people.

What then may be suggested, by the inscription on the cross, as compared with other circumstances in connexion with the rise of Christianity? This question we shall endeavour to answer, by FIRST NOTICING THE INSCRIPTION ITSELF; SECONDLY, THE LANGUAGES IN WHICH IT WAS WRITTEN:

I. First, we shall notice the ecclesiastico-political aspect of this inscription:—"The King of the Jews."

In the Gospel according to John—(xix. 19, 20.) we read, "and Pilate wrote a title, and put it on the cross. And the writing was, *Jesus of*

Nazareth, the King of the Jews. And it was written in HEBREW, AND GREEK, AND LATIN." In Mark's Gospel—(xv. 26.) this title is called "the superscription of his accusation;" also in Matthew—(xxvii. 37.) we are told, "they set over his head *his accusation* written, this is Jesus the King of the Jews." This is the pretended crime for which "the Chief Priests" of the Jews sought by popular clamour to obtain his condemnation from the Roman governor Pilate. Hence they said to Pilate, write not "the King of the Jews," but that "he said I am King of the Jews." They had in their own priestly conclave, condemned him for blasphemy, but having now lost the power of capital punishment, together with their national independence, they sought to gain a second sentence from Pilate on an entirely different charge of sedition or treason. Thus priests have ever acted, pretending to those holding the secular power, that heretics are seditious; and that the throne and the mitre stand or fall together.

As a bishop, addressing Charles II, an exceedingly profligate man, though a "most religious king," observes (in dedicating to him the ecclesiastical polity of Hooker,) that "*sedition naturally arises out of schism;*" and therefore all opposition to this polity is "factious and fallacious; yea, dangerous and destructive to the peace and prosperity of this Church and kingdom, *whose inseparable happiness and interests are bound up in Monarchy and Episcopacy.*"

So the chief priests did with Christ, in the Jewish Inquisition or Spiritual court, they condemned him for blasphemy; and in the Roman Civil Court they accused him of sedition and treason. They changed a spiritual offence into a civil crime, and terrified the State to avenge the Church. This conduct by subsequent priests, was well described by one of the early English Reformers, in a work called "The Practice of Prelates;" some parts of which read as a just satire on our own times. "The old Scribes and Pharisees," says this author, "darkened the Scripture with their traditions, and false interpretations," but our Lord having confounded "this juggling and hypocrisy," then these Scribes and Pharisees "got them unto the elders of the people, and persuaded them, saying, this man is surely of the devil, and his miracles be of the devil no doubt. And these good works which he doth in healing the people, yea, and his preaching against our covetousness, are but a cloak to bring him unto his purpose; that when he hath gotten him disciples enough, he may rise against the emperor, and make himself king. And then shall the *Romans come and take our land from us*, and carry away our people, and put other nations in our realm: and so we shall lose all that we have, and the most part of our lives thereto. Take heed therefore betimes, while there is remedy, ere he go that far that ye be not able to resist him.

The elders of the people, *though before they in a manner favoured Christ*, or at leastway were *indifferent*, not greatly caring whether God or the Devil reigned, so that they might bide in their authority, feared immediately, (as Herod did the loss of *his kingdom*, when the wise men asked where the new-born King of the Jews was,) and conspired with the Scribes and Pharisees against Christ, and took him, and brought him to Pilate, saying, we have found this fellow perverting the people, and forbidding to pay tribute to Cæsar, and saying that he is king, and moving the people from Galilee unto this place. Then Pilate though *he likewise*

was before indifferent, put now in fear of the loss of his office, through such persuasions, slew innocent Christ."

"Even so" adds this reformer, "*our scribes and pharisees, now that their hypocrisy is disclosed, and their falsehood so brought to light, that it can no longer be hid, get them unto the elders of the people, the lords, gentlemen and temporal officers, and to all that love this world as they do; and unto whosoever is great with the king, and unto the king's grace himself: and after the same ensample, and with the SAME PERSUASIONS, cast them into like fear of losing their worldly dominions, and roar unto them, saying, ye be neglectful and care nothing at all, but have a good sport that the heretics rail on us. But give them space a while till they be grown into a multitude, and then ye shall see them preach as fast against you, and do their best to THRUST YOU DOWN also, and shall cry havoc, and make all common.*"

The intelligent reader will easily perceive the analogies of this case with our own times, the "practice of prelates" our scribes and pharisees, is the same; they still terrify the elders of the people; make schism disloyalty; and appeal to the elders of the people, lest "the Romans should come and take away our place and nation." And these elders though before indifferent, nay even favouring with large sums the dreaded sect, yet finding their own authority in danger, like the Elders and Pilate, save their places by a timely or politic injustice.

Whilst of our scribes and pharisees, as all priests, (with or without the name,) the description of this reformer still holds good—"What care they? their causes must be avenged. He is not worthy to be a king who will not avenge their quarrels." "The Prelates took the king's sword, (as all the kings' swords since,) . . and coupled their cause unto the king's cause, and made it TREASON to RESIST THE BISHOPS, (as now) and thrust them into king's prisons, (as now) *so that it is no new invention that they now do, but even an old practice*, though they have done their busy cure to hide their science that their conveyance should not be espied.*"

We however know well whence this practice was conveyed, transferred, or stolen, namely from the chief priests of the Jews, who led Christ away from Caiaphas, the Prelates' Court, to the Judgment Hall of Pilate the Civil Ruler, and changed the charge from blasphemy to sedition, from a spiritual question to a civil crime; that he might come under the scourge of the Civil Supremacy. Saying "we have found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ a King."—(Luke xxiii. 2.) These lying priests had found no such thing; they had found that he denied the validity and permanence of their orders; and therefore sought to make him odious on another ground; as if opposed to Cæsar to whom they themselves were crafty and disloyal. They cared not for Cæsar, they hated his supremacy, but employed it to secure their malicious ends.

NOW IT WAS THIS FALSE CHARGE, WHICH WAS PUT UP ON THE CROSS: the charge of treason against the Civil Supremacy: this accusation was written over the cross,—THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS! It was obtained by the deceit of priests, and yielded by the time-serving cowardice, and latitudinarian policy of Pilate the Civil Ruler.

* William Tyndale, "Practice of Prelates."

This is the *ecclesiasto-political* aspect of the superscription "of his accusation written over him." A lesson that priests and rulers have too often followed; but which liberty, common sense and Christianity alike condemn.

This title was put up partly to shame the Jews, that their degradation might be mingled with their triumph; it was giving them gall mingled with vinegar. They wanted Pilate to write, "he said I am the King of the Jews;" but no, he is your King. It expressed contempt for their nation; this is the way we Romans trample on Jewish Majesty. "You charge him with treason, and force me to crucify him; then be it so; behold your King!" Thus their private malice was at the expense of their country's honour. "Shall I crucify your King?" "We have no king but Cæsar!"—the very multitude perhaps that once wanted to make Christ a temporal monarch; the very people and priests who hated Cæsar and his tax-gatherers. It was fitting that their own ignominy and the contempt of the civil power, should be shewn towards the priests and nation, that had thus by clamour wrested the law to their will.

This inscription on the cross then, involved the degradation of the Jewish people; expressed the contempt of Pilate, he would crucify "their King," if they demanded a victim, it should be at their own expense:—"Jesus of Nazareth the *King of the Jews*."

This is emphatically expressed to us, the conduct of a dominant priesthood, turning piety towards God into sedition against government; changing heresy into treason, and being themselves the scorn of the governments whose tools they are, and whose swords they employ.

And thus much for *the inscription itself*:—its ecclesiastico-political aspect: we have to notice more fully

II. THE LANGUAGES IN WHICH IT WAS WRITTEN, and the lessons suggested thereby. It was written (John xix. 20.) "*in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin*." Luke varies the order, and says, it was written "in letters of Greek, and Hebrew, and Latin." But the point they had to record, and to which our attention is directed, is not the order of these languages, but the fact of *these three* being used on that occasion.

1. And we may observe in the first place, *the peculiar juncture of circumstances, which rendered the use of these three languages appropriate to a public notice.*

At what other time, and in what other place, would such an inscription be of any public service?

Would it do in Greece or Italy now, where the Greek and Roman languages are forgotten by the populace; and where they know nothing of Hebrew? Would it not be ridiculous in England or America? Would it be of any service in Jerusalem now, or would it have been understood there, in any other age of the world? No!

Then how came it to be so suitable in the days of Pontius Pilate? Because Jews by their travels, had learned other languages, and many strangers were in Jerusalem, at the annual feast, *prepared to carry back the news to the countries in which they had settled.*

But more especially, because the Greek language had extended very widely, both among the common people and amongst the learned; preserving the mental power of Greece, when its political power had crum-

bled: because Hebrew was the sacred and vernacular language of the people living there; in other words, the original language of the country: because the Roman or Latin language was the language of the conquerors, —Pilate, his court and soldiers. *And this proves that the events of Christianity occurred in the age to which they are ascribed*; both because (as we shall see,) they could not have occurred under any other circumstances; and because these three languages as a public inscription, would have suited no other country, nor any other age of the world.

Whatever an infidel may say about the doctrines of Christianity, these facts in its historical development, are a proof of its genuineness; and fully considered, amount to as great a miracle (in the coincidences of providence) as any other miracle recorded in the Scriptures. It was as much out of the common course of human history, for these circumstances of advantage to be assembled at the origin of Christianity, as for a man to be raised from the dead.

2. We observe therefore in the second place, that the same circumstances which rendered these three languages appropriate, made it possible for the events here recorded to occur.

An ancient prophecy, recorded not in the Christian Scriptures, but in the Jewish;—the Scriptures of those who murdered and still reject Jesus of Nazareth,—this Jewish prophecy declared, “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, till the Shiloh come.”—(Gen. xlix. 10.) Such is one inscription, *still in Hebrew*—the Shiloh is to come, on the departure of the sceptre.

That is, some great personage was to appear, when Judea lost its sovereignty;—when an enemy could write on a cross—“the King of the Jews.” The Sceptre must have departed, the nation must be subjugated to a foreign power, before the highest magistrate and representative of that sceptre could be openly crucified; either in mockery or reality. So that this Roman conquest of Judea which was in other respects necessary, was also in fulfilment of a Hebrew prophecy.

Besides, had the power of capital punishment remained in the hands of the Jews, *the death of Christ would have been of a different kind.*

The Jewish council condemned him for blasphemy, and their punishment for this was stoning to death. “And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, bring forth him that hath cursed without the camp; and let all that heard him, lay their hands upon his head, and let all the congregation stone him. And thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel, saying, whosoever curseth his God shall bear his sin. And he that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, he shall surely be put to death, and all the congregation shall certainly stone him: as well the stranger, as he that is born in the land, when he blasphemeth the name of the Lord, shall be put to death.”—(Levit. xxiv. 13—16.)

But since Christ was declared by the Jews to have broken this law, how happened it that he was not stoned? It was because the Roman power had taken from the Jews this authority over life and death; and therefore, though they could say, “we have a law, and by our law he ought to die;” they were checked by another fact,—“it is not (now) lawful for us to put any man to death:” their sceptre was broken; it was fully impugned at the cross, so that the Shiloh might come in the power of his resurrection.

We find indeed, that on a subsequent occasion, in the case of Stephen, the Jews took the law again into their own hands; but this was an outrage against the laws of that Cæsar whom they declared to be their only king. Stephen was accused of speaking "blasphemous words against Moses and against God."—(Acts vi. 9—15.) And after his defence, which was so clear and forcible that (as often happens) his enemies hated him the more, they stoned him because they could not answer him.—(Acts vii.)

Nothing gives greater offence to some, than a good defence. How then was it, that Christ was not stoned in like manner? The Civil Power was at hand, to *turn the rage of priests into a constitutional channel*. But for this, Christianity would not have had the sign of the cross. And yet it will seem strange, that even Romans should adopt this method of punishment, which was considered too ignominious for a Roman citizen. The plain answer is, Christ was not a citizen, but a member of a conquered nation; the conquest, by putting him in the power of the Romans, prevented his being stoned to death, and by placing him beneath the civil dignity of a Roman, secured his crucifixion. Thus all these circumstances must combine, before it could be written in LATIN over the cross—"Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews."

This same Roman conquest also saved the body of Christ from deforming rage, and such usage as without an extra miracle, would have prevented the apostles from identifying him on his resurrection. Whilst the kindness of Pilate, in giving up the body of Jesus to Joseph of Arimathea, prevented that indiscriminate destruction together with the bodies of the two malefactors, which would have prevented all proof of his resurrection.

And thus, according to another ancient Hebrew prophecy, "he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death, because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth."—(Isa. liii. 9.) Pilate gave up the body of Jesus to Joseph, of Arimathea, a rich man, because he was convinced of the Saviour's innocence, ("that he had done no violence;") and was glad to make what amends he could. *It was the Latin inscription on the cross,—the Roman Eagle—that preserved the body of Christ from indecent and lawless violence.*

That which rendered this Latin inscription suitable then, namely, the presence of the Roman power, as the subjugation of Judea, was the only event which rendered the crucifixion possible, and the resurrection proveable. It was surely a miraculous providence, that these circumstances met together in "the fulness of times." This combination of political and ecclesiastical circumstances, was a miracle in itself; and has no parallel in history.

3. We may notice in the third place, respecting these three languages, their meaning and advantage, as to the nature and progress of Christianity.

THE HEBREW LANGUAGE, allied this event, (the foundation of a new religion) with all that had gone before in the history of that peculiar people; and placed their future generations everywhere in an antagonism that confirms its origin. It pointed out one safeguard of Christian evidence—the Hebrew Scriptures, preserved by a race that is

hostile to the religion which finds its prophetic defences in those very Scriptures.

It makes the study of Hebrew and the eastern languages generally, another source of Christian information.

But further than this; it provided out of that people, the earnest missionaries of the cross on which their own language was inscribed: and opened a way for these missionaries into every synagogue scattered over the face of the civilized world. Thus also adding evidence and preparation for another fact yet to be noticed,—that Christianity was intended as *the universal* religion.

THE ROMAN OR LATIN LANGUAGE, indicated similar advantages; it opened up the whole Roman empire, for the messengers of the cross, to follow the legions of Rome. As our dominions in India and conquests in China however unjustifiably obtained, are now overruled by providence for the same ends. Thus the Eagle prepares the way for the Dove. Nor should we overlook the important fact, that the chosen vessel of Christ, to bear his name before gentiles and kings, was a Roman citizen;—of Tarsus, “no mean city.”

So the Latin inscription, was still upon the cross; and Paul took every advantage of this civil privilege: as we see from his refusal to come out of prison till the magistrates had been and made a handsome apology.

“And when it was day, the magistrates sent the serjeants, saying, let those men go. And the keeper of the prison told this saying to Paul, the magistrates have sent to let you go: now therefore depart, and go in peace. But Paul said unto them, they have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast *us* into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? nay verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out. And the serjeants told these words unto the magistrates: and they feared, when they heard that they were Romans. And they came and besought them, and brought *them* out, and desired *them* to depart out of the city.”—(Acts xvi. 35—39.)

“The chief captain commanded him to be brought into the castle, and bade that he should be examined by scourging; that he might know wherefore they cried so against him. And as they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by, is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned? When the centurion heard *that*, he went and told the chief captain, saying, take heed what thou doest: for this man is a Roman.”—(Acts xxii. 24—26.)

So this Latin inscription was still on the cross, protecting Christ's body, for it gave *Paul his passport throughout the Roman empire*.

This was again, a wonderful advantage and coincidence, pointing also to the universality of the gospel religion.

THE GREEK LANGUAGE, afforded additional advantages, on which a volume might be written, *allying Christianity as it did, with an imperishable literature*: for the Greek tongue, like its art of sculpture, and architecture, is still the model of taste and refinement. Other languages have died out; and this is left only as a literature—a written, not a spoken language; and together with the Latin preserved in the same way, forms the culture of nearly all civilized nations.

In this, we have a pledge of the *permanence* of Christianity, as well

as its *intelligent character*, being thus in God's wonderful providence *the ally not of ignorance, but of learning and refinement*. The revival of learning, was the revival of Greek literature, and this was the revival of Christianity;—the earnest of the Reformation.

This important fact—the extent and influence of the Greek language, is forcibly set forth in the preface to Macaulay's "*Lays of Ancient Rome*." The following passages noticed accidentally during the consideration of the present subject, will confirm our argument.

"The Latin literature which has come down to us is of later date than the commencement of the second Punic war, and *consists almost exclusively of works fashioned on Greek models*."

The Poets imitated the Greeks both for metre and subject; as well as the Orators, who "constantly proposed to themselves as patterns, the speeches of Demosthenes and Lysias."

Speaking of the disappearance (from these causes) of the ancient ballad literature, Mr. Macaulay observes, "it will not appear strange when we consider **HOW COMPLETE WAS THE TRIUMPH OF THE GREEK GENIUS over the public mind of Italy**. . . . The conquered, says Horace, led captive the conquerors. *It was precisely at the time when the Roman people rose to unrivalled political ascendancy that they stooped to pass under the intellectual yoke*."

It was precisely at the time when the sceptre departed from Greece, that **THE EMPIRE OF HER LANGUAGE AND HER ARTS BECAME UNIVERSAL AND DESPOTIC**.

Thus when Rome had conquered Greece, and had begun to study with docility the Grecian language and arts, God put his gospel into Greek—to lie in the way of Scholars throughout all time.

Consider what had been the case, if the gospels had been written in a barbarous dialect, unknown to the civilized world? As for instance, the ancient British language, and shut out from mankind: it would have died with the Druids, or retired into Wales; now it will live with the learning and civilization which it ennobles and preserves. Here again is the providence of God—in the preservation of the gospel,—in the language of universal learning. Shewing that it is to live and be a light unto the world.

4. And on the combination of these languages we may observe, further, that *Christianity was intended TO BE UNDERSTOOD*. There on the cross, (a true emblem of the system,) we find *all the languages requisite for the people*; Greek, Hebrew, and Latin. And so the Holy Ghost furnished the apostles, not with stores of ordnance; not with the gift of arms, but the gift of tongues, to effect the spiritual conquest of the world: fulfilling the Druidical emblem of Hercules Ogmius, who was represented as holding men's ears to his lips, in gentle and willing captivity, with chains of gold and amber. This was Christ conquering mankind by the greatness and heroism of Divine Thoughts, uttered in Greek, and Hebrew, and Latin, and every language spoken on the globe: until Parthians and Elamites, and dwellers in Mesopotamia, in England, America, China, and Africa, shall hear in their own tongue, the wonderful works of God.

The priests who crucified Christ, would stifle his gospel, and worship in a dead language; but Paul said he would sooner speak five words of

sense, of intelligible language, than five thousand in "Holy Latin," which no people on earth now can understand. And while Priests pray in a foreign tongue, (to hide the folly of their prayers) he would pray with the understanding also. Hence the gospel, and all divine services, "are nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart,"—in thy language, for thine understanding and obedience. Those three languages were the public speech of men in those days; and so the Apostles spake with other tongues than their vernacular, to meet the intelligence of their hearers; hence from this inscription and its analogies, we learn that Christianity was to be understood—not to be hidden by priests' Latin: whilst further, it was to wield this force of speech or persuasion, not the carnal weapons of persecution and violence.

The very opposite of all this, may be seen in the following extract from the Sermon of the Rev. John Henry Newman, D.D., Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. This sermon on the Catholic hierarchy was preached on the day of enthroning the Bishop of Birmingham, in St. Chad's Cathedral, of that town. Speaking of the old or antiquated religion which formerly darkened our daylight, and is vainly expected to do so again; he observes, "it grew and expanded like a *beautiful pageant* . . . it was at once a *teaching* and a *worship*; it had a *dogma a mystery*, a ritual of its own; it had an hierarchical form. A brotherhood of holy pastors, with mitre and crosier, and uplifted hand walked forth and *blessed* and ruled the joyful people. The crucifix headed the procession, and *simple* monks were there with hearts in prayer, and sweet chaunts resounded, and the HOLY LATIN TONGUE was *heard*, and boys came forth in white, swinging censers, and the fragrant CLOUD arose, and *mass* was sung and *saints* were invoked." . . . So had we "the stately march of *blessed* services, high festival, and *gorgeous procession*, and *soothing dirge*, and *passing bell*," &c., "till he who recollected the *OLD Pagan* time, would conclude he did but see a vision, so marvellously was *heaven let down* upon earth, &c."

This beautiful pageant of crosiers, mitres, incense pots, and crucifixes, boys in white and men in black; was nothing but a vision of the old Pagan times, a little altered to burlesque the gospel, and show how "heaven" could be "let down"—degraded and insulted on earth. The mass was indeed a deep mystery to ignorant people, being sung in "*the Holy Latin tongue*," which the people indeed might "hear;" but which none of the people, and few of the "simple monks" could understand.

Latin was put on the cross, because Latins or Romans were there to read it; in like manner the Greek and Hebrew; so the Apostles spake with different languages, and prayed in the mother tongue of their hearers:—*then in the old Christian times, languages were used which everybody could understand; but in the modern Pagan days of Rome, that language is used which nobody can understand.* Thus do they blind the people with the Holy Latin Tongue, and a cloud of incense for worship: whilst for teaching they enlighten by crosiers, crucifixes, sacraments and pantomimes. Christianity was to be understood: therefore spoke in every man's tongue—the wonderful works of God; which priests stifle in Holy Latin—a *dead* language.

5. Further we may observe, that *these three languages were involved in*

the structure of the gospel itself. God who built this asylum of mercy, this great fabric of truth, not only struck off this medal—the inscription on the cross—to commemorate the age and circumstances of laying the foundation stone; but mingled these three styles in the edifice itself. *The gospel is written in Greek, and Hebrew, and Latin:* nobody could write like it now-a-days. There are three distinct nationalities, the slow growth of many centuries, meeting here, and blending in this one production; it is no mushroom forgery of a day, but the growth of ages into “the fulness of times.”

In this respect alone we have nothing like it anywhere. We find in it, Hebrew idioms, shewing that it was written by Hebrew men, tinged with the style and thoughts of the Judaism they had abandoned. We see the Greek language used, in the dialect at which it had arrived in those days: we meet with Roman names—centurion, denarius, publican;—all social, commercial, and political terms, indicating a conquering class; whilst the very death on the cross itself, is a Latin inscription, explained only by the presence of the Roman Magistrate. So is the gospel written in Greek, Hebrew, and Latin. As the three main orders of Architecture, Doric, Ionic and Corinthian, were the results of three orders of taste and classes of people, forming separate styles that may be blended together; so God in his providence blended the elements of three prominent peoples—religious, philosophical, and political—Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, in the style and framework of the gospel.

It would form a curious and instructive study to detect these various elements in the events and style of the New Testament, and would no doubt richly repay an accurate and learned investigation. We profess not to enter into this province, but simply to indicate it. Besides peculiarities of words and expressions, there are customs, manners, divisions of time, &c., which plainly shew forth the various elements we have described. The following instance may suffice. In Matt. xiv. 25, we read that “in the *FOURTH watch* of the night Jesus went unto” the disciples.

The note of Kuinoel on this passage is a simple and incidental illustration of our present proposition, that the elements of these three nationalities are to be found in the New Testament. The *ancient Jews* says Kuinoel, divided the night into *three* parts of four hours each; but the *Romans* (following the Greeks) divided the night into four parts. Hence the Jews being subjected to Rome, imitated this *ROMAN METHOD*, and themselves also divided the night into four parts, of three hours each; which four parts or watches, Mark distinguishes from each other by their appropriate names. These names we find thus translated in our English version:—“for ye know not when the master of the house cometh; at even, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning.”—(Mark xiii. 35.)

This fourfold division of the night, derived from the Greeks by the Romans, and carried by conquest into Judea, is a sufficient indication of the fact here asserted;—that the gospel itself is written in Greek, and Hebrew and Latin—has in its own literary structure evidence of the meeting together of these three nationalities at the point of the crucifixion.

6. Finally, respecting these three languages, we have suggested to us

another important lesson,—*that Christianity is intended to be THE UNIVERSAL RELIGION.* All the various adaptations, coincidences and advantages glanced at in this enquiry, point to this great fact, in which every human being is concerned :—*that the religion of Christ is FOR EVERY CREATURE.*

This was the true “fulness of times,” in which the seeming favoritism towards the Jews, became the advantage of the Gentiles ; shewing that unto us, and not (merely) to themselves did they minister ; in their temple and rites and the preservation of their Hebrew Scriptures.

The fulness was for us ;—to fill the wide world. And as the true pledge and augury of this, we find this small and in some respects isolated people (the Jews,) become the centre of history ; since by conquest and by foreign settlements, they were absorbed into the universal empire, and branched out into almost every city and place. And all this happened when a new sect arose to follow this crucified Lord ;—a sect arising in the centre of Palestine, (when that country was subjected,) so as both to mingle with its conquerors, and lay hold of the pervading and permanent language : being by its own truths and hopes suited to the understanding and wants of mankind, whilst by the gift of tongues, it was proclaimed in every language ; and is still being translated and carried abroad as the solitary instance of an encroaching antagonistic and all-conquering religion : confined to no race, imprisoned in no geological boundaries, buried in no single language, but traversing the earth to bless all its inhabitants every one in his own tongue !

Thus we have briefly examined this fruitful question,—the inscription on the cross, first looking at the inscription itself ; as involving a false charge of treason, a civil crime, when the priests had really condemned their victim for a spiritual offence. Thus deducing the theory of persecution, and the practice of prelates from the Chief Priests and Pharisees.

Secondly, we considered the three languages in which the accusation was written, and found that they would suit no other place in the world, and no other time in the world's history : thus affording another evidence of the historical truthfulness of the gospel.

Whilst further we have learned that only the circumstances which made the languages suitable, rendered the events possible. The meaning and advantage of these three languages as allied to Christianity ; including the Roman power ; the Hebrew earnestness ; the Grecian learning ; all indicating both that Christianity was intended to be understood ;—a matter not of blindness but insight ; not of force but persuasion : and that it is to be universal. Whilst in the structure of the gospel itself, as involving the three languages—Greek, and Hebrew, and Latin, together with the gift of tongues, we found a sufficient proof of the justness of these analogies.

Let us then read this inscription, it is in Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew, and English : it says to us—behold the man ;—not the King of the Jews, but the Lord of life and glory, who stooped to this ignominy, that he might be preached in all languages.

And on his cross is this inscription—*as amongst THE FUNDAMENTALS*—that “first of all,” “he died for our sins,” that it may be declared in every language in the world—“He, by the grace of God, tasted death for every one.”

II.

PRIEST'S RELIGION.

HUMAN AUTHORITY AND INVENTION *versus* CONSCIENCE AND THE BIBLE.

The Scriptures are the only standard of Christian faith and practice : every one is at liberty to examine them ; but no one is at liberty to decline this examination : and though we may receive the help of others, we may not rest on their authority, (which is man-worship ;) nor receive as religion, what is not in the Scriptures, (which is will-worship.)

PETER'S KEYS, AND THE POPE'S PICKLOCKS: OR, BINDING AND LOOSING.

THE CHURCH OF ROME cannot so much be said to found its spiritual despotism on any passages of Scripture, as to adduce passages in case of need, to palliate her assumptions : accordingly it usually happens, that as her pretensions are a violation of common sense, so her use of Scripture violates common decency. She proceeds on no principle to deduce truths from Scripture, but by artifices seeks to gain over the Bible to the plan which her ambition has marked out.

The keys of the kingdom have long hung at her girdle, to secure all treasures, and lock men up in the cell of her own ignorance ; the fisherman's net hangs over the side of her vessel—ready to catch all—both good and bad ; all is fish that comes to that net : the tentmaker lengthens his cords to cover the face of the earth ; the father confessor has the key to all domestic, personal, and civil secrets, a string tied to every man and woman, by which he can follow them into privacy ; so that a true son of the Church, cannot enter into his closet and shut to the door, without shutting the priest in with him. And whatever there may be, in thought or action, which should never be the subject of conversation,—that must be the sacred topic in the confessional.

Should we refuse this ; then the Church which possesses the keys, can lock us up in the condemned cell ; terrify us with the refusal of the last rites, and consign us to such tender mercies of God, as are not in Church covenants.

This fearful power is wielded over free-born men, for whom also Christ died ;—and the slender foundation for this iron rule, is the declaration of Christ,—“Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church ; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven : and whatsoever thou shalt

bind on earth shall be bound in heaven : and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.”—(Matt. xvi. 18, 19.) “Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven : and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.”—(Matt. xviii. 18.) “Then said Jesus to them again, peace be unto you : as my Father hath sent me; even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, receive ye the Holy Ghost : whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them ; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.”—(John xx. 21—23.)

We have already explained the true nature of the keys of the kingdom of heaven ; being nothing else but the solution of the divine mysteries, by the gospel of Christ : a key originally given by the Holy Ghost, to the Apostles ; and since published to the world in writing. In other words, the New Testament is the key to the divine purposes.

The use of the keys in this respect, is preaching Christianity. But since another function of authority is assumed, of a very different nature, falsely called “binding and loosing,” more properly called “playing fast and loose ;” it may be useful to expose this cheat also. For in the Great Exhibition of all Nations, the wares of Rome stand prominently forward, with colourings and pretensions suited to a Chinese sign-board.

The only means of detecting fraud of this kind, is to present the real article alongside the false : truth in contact with error ; bring Christ to confront Antichrist, and so destroy him with the brightness of the Saviour’s coming ;—the lustre of his gospel.

I. We shall therefore first examine the pretensions of Rome ; the Pope’s picklocks,—or methods of “binding and loosing ;”

II. The true keys of Peter, and the apostolic method of “binding and loosing ;”

III. The reason why these keys were given to Peter.

1. The pretensions of Rome ;—the Pope’s picklocks, and his Church’s use of them :—to bind and to loose. To bind heavy burdens on the people, and loose the priests from touching them with their little finger.

Among other improvements and inventions of this age, we have been called to notice long dissertations on patent safety locks, and keys of peculiar construction, that defy treachery ; the Pope also has claimed by patent right the key of heaven and hell ; that is, of his Church and of excommunication ; the two respective ways to these places—according to sign-posts in Holy Latin.

But the intelligent examiner will find that Christ has the only patent key ; he “openeth and no man shutteth ;” the door to heaven stands open now for ever ; or, if in any sense it be closed, Christ has left the “key of his promises,” which will secure an entrance since Christ is also the door, and knows his own key.

The most treacherous use to which the Pope’s imitation keys are subservient ; is in putting men in or out of a salvable state, according to their submission or non-submission to the dictation of a priest. Every heretic, is of course excommunicated *ipso facto* ; but neither is any Catholic safe ; since he is dependent for the forgiveness of his sins on the decision of his father confessor ; who must first know all his secrets, and then can either absolve him, or enforce a penance ;—either bind or loose.

It is at the peril of a man's salvation, to disobey this; for say they, "whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted, and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."

This the priests claim absolutely for themselves; and so stand to the people in the place of Almighty God. As an illustration of this blasphemous assumption, we need quote only the popular catechism, in which everything offensive to Protestants, is modified with nicer care than is requisite in Italy or Spain.

In "The Catholic Christian Instructed," by the Right Rev. Richard Challoner, D.D., chap. ix. treats of "the sacrament of penance: of confession, of absolution, &c."

Here we are instructed, that "the sacrament of penance" is "an institution of Christ, by which our sins are forgiven, *into which we fall after baptism.*" So the priest has complete mastery over us; baptism is the door into the kingdom, sins after this, expel us, and we can be restored only by the sacrament of penance, by which, after certain preliminaries, we "are absolved from our sins by the minister of God." This power as belonging to the ministers of God is proved "from John xx. 22, 23, *whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; whose sins you shall retain, &c.* And Matt. xviii. 18, Amen, I say unto you, whatsoever you shall bind on earth, &c."

These passages are quoted by this Right Rev., in proof of an institution of a sacrament of penance, confession, &c., when the writer knew well that *no such things are mentioned by the Redeemer.*

And his next defence of this pretended institution or wilful forgery is, that "the Protestant Church so understands these texts, in the order for the visitation of the sick, in the Common Prayer-book, where she prescribes a *form* of absolution, the same in substance as that used by the Catholic Church, viz: 'our Lord Jesus Christ, *who hath left power to his Church* to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences; and by *his authority committed to me* I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.'"

This is a strange use of *Protestant authority* for Popish doctrine: and unfortunately it is of no validity, since this Protestant assumption and blasphemy, was borrowed from the Papists, and therefore cannot be adduced as a proof of the truth of papal doctrine: it only proves that in this respect some Protestants are Romanists. The Church of Christ has received no authority to absolve men from sin; that is the work of God, and he absolves us when we repent and believe in Christ. We are not to believe in or obey his Church; which is a company of those who believe in and obey him.

The pretended "sacrament of penance," is a very circuitous way of obtaining absolution. First, "three things are required on the part of the sinner; *contrition*,—a hearty sorrow for offending God, with a firm purpose of amendment: *confession*,—a sincere accusation made to God's minister of all mortal sins;" but because venial sins "do not (like mortal ones) exclude eternally from the kingdom of heaven, there is not so strict an obligation of having recourse for the remission of them to *the keys of the Church.*" "*Satisfaction*,—a faithful performance of the penance

enjoined by the priest," is the third thing required for absolution. Not the performance of what is enjoined by Christ, but by the priest.

Besides the above three things, (in any one of which a Catholic may fail, and so lose the advantage of absolution,) "a person preparing for confession has these four things to do, (which with the three above mentioned, make *seven things to do for only one Catholic rite.**) 1. He must pray earnestly to God for grace to make a true and good confession. 2. Carefully examine his conscience to find out what sins he has committed, and how often. 3. Take *due time* to beg God's pardon. 4. Make firm resolutions, to avoid like sins."

We should naturally suppose that if he have *God's pardon*, he would not need the *priest's*; since "there is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus;" but this would make "the Church's keys" worthless; and would be exalting the satisfaction made by the Redeemer at the expense of the satisfaction enjoined by the "father confessor," without whom no Catholic can be saved. For the confessor has the keys, and locks out of heaven for all mortal sins, the chief of which are sins against the Church.

For in examining his conscience, to prepare for confession, "the common method (for the sinner) is, to consider what one has done against the commandments of God, *what neglects there might have been of CHURCH'S PRECEPTS*; . . . how far one has been guilty of *any of THE SEVEN SINS commonly called capital*:" and for helping a person's memory in this regard, *THE TABLE OF SINS* which is found in the manual, or other Prayer-books, may be of no small service."

A Catholic must confess that this is a little more complicated than any institution of Christ; and sets up a table of sins with a way of forgiving them, both burdensome and uncertain to the sinner, as well as chiefly invented by the Church—not enjoined by the Saviour.

The seven things requisite for confession, are subdivided into more than seven particulars under each: requiring not only a remembrance of the number of sins, but a skill in the science of wickedness, to discriminate the different headings of *the table* to which each sin belongs, &c., &c.

"It is a great crime to conceal any mortal sin in confession, because it is *telling a lie to the Holy Ghost*; (i. e. the priest;) for which kind of sin Ananias and Sapphira were struck dead." This is binding the people to the loose doctrines of the priesthood, who seem bold enough to support their craft by the same method as Ananias adopted to save his self.

Otherwise, if the two who lied to the Holy Ghost as well as to Peter, were struck dead "by a just judgment of God;" we might expect the same just judgment to be repeated on erring Catholics. But no, they escape this danger, *not from the tenderness but the weakness of the priests*; for the same Right Revd. instructor adds, "it is a great crime to conceal one's sins in confession, but also a great folly and madness; because such offenders, if they have not renounced their faith [in the priests,] *know very well that these sins must be confessed, or that THEY MUST BURN FOR THEM.*"

The tender mercies of priests are cruel: thus do they hold men in

* We may in a future number point out the variety of things required of a good Catholic; as the Angelus Domini, thrice three Hail Mary's daily, &c. &c. &c.

bondage, by vague spiritual terrors; and shut up all other avenues to heaven, but the door of the confessional, *making that and not Christ the door*: whilst the priest holds the keys. Other foundation can no Catholic lay, than confession to the priest for priestly absolution. He must confess, and get pardon there, or burn for it! Then the priest is the Saviour, and his key is the true cross.

The Apostle Paul indeed says, "other foundation can no man lay, than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ;" but the Catholic priesthood have presumed upon another scheme: when will the eyes of their followers be opened?

The whole pretence is, that the Church, i.e. the priests, having power to forgive sins, must know all these sins, and even *the circumstances* under which they were committed, that they may judge of their nature, the amount of penance to be enjoined, &c. This opens the road for all filthy communications, deepening the pollutions of both priests and people.

And what is the foundation for this vast edifice or spiritual prison? The words of Christ to his own Apostles, are quoted over and over again, as if these belonged to the priests, or referred to confession at all. And in addition, a series of Scripture passages is quoted, to prove that this "*sacrament of penance*" is "*an institution of Christ, by which our sins are forgiven which we fall into after baptism.*"

This forgiveness is the power of absolution given to the priests. The following passages are quoted in proof—that we should thus and for such reasons, "confess our sins to God's ministers." "When a man or woman shall commit any sin which men commit, to do a trespass against the Lord, and that person be guilty, then they shall *confess* their sin, &c."—(Numbers v. 6, 7.) The Instructor does not quote further than this; nor does he show that the word *confess* means private confession to a priest, as a practice or ordinance for the people in general. A Protestant may "confess" his faults; but he would not go to the Romish confessional. This method therefore is *simply a deception of people, by the sound of a word*. Indeed if the whole passage in Numbers had been quoted, "the Catholic Christian" would have been "instructed" in the fact that the confession there meant, is of *offences against men*, contrary to God's law; and if the injured men could be found, the confession was then to be made, *not to the priest, but to the persons injured*. The injurer, "shall recompense (to the injured) his trespass, with the principal thereof; and add unto it the fifth part thereof, and GIVE IT UNTO HIM AGAINST WHOM HE HATH TRESPASSED."—(Numbers v. 7.) It did not suit the Instructor to tell his readers this: *he must falsify the books of Moses, to prove the Romish confession an institution of Jesus Christ*. The whole meaning of the command in Numbers is, that any one having robbed another, is to restore the booty. But this is the usual way in which the Bible is quoted by Roman Catholic teachers: we hope that since they so refer to the Scriptures, their scholars will begin to examine the places and context.

This Instructor proceeds to assert as a further proof, that 2ndly, those who hearkened to John the Baptist, were baptized by him, *confessing their sins*."—(Matt. iii. vi.) Now this was confession *at baptism*, not of

sins *after* baptism; so is not to the point: also, it was public and not private; being done simply by the act of submitting to baptism; not by enumerating sins *at the ear* of John; whilst further, it was no institution of Christianity, but like Judaism, was before Christianity.

3rdly. "The prescription of James, *confess your sins one to another*, that is, to the priests and elders of the Church." Here is another plain falsification of Scripture; to "confess to one another," is not for all to confess to the priest; but is a mutual duty, binding on all Christians: *and requires the priest to confess to us, as much as us to him*. It refers not to sins against God, but differences amongst Christians; and has no connexion with any priestly office. IT IS NOT A SACRAMENT OF RELIGION, BUT A SOCIAL DUTY.

4thly. The practice of *the first Christians*—"many of them came confessing and declaring their deeds." This refers to no daily or customary action; but to what was done *once*; and not by "*the first Christians*" as a general rule, but *some* of them, on *one particular occasion*. It is a description of the conduct of some *on their conversion*; not any rule of Christ for Christians during their whole course.

Thus do these priests wrest the Scriptures to their own condemnation and to the shameful delusion of the people.

And behold the topstone of this monstrous fabric of Church power, "The penitent having duly prepared himself—kneels down at the confessional on one side of the priest, and making the sign of the cross on himself, says, 'pray father, give me your blessing'; then the priest *blesses* him in the following words: 'the Lord be in thy heart and on thy lips, that thou mayest truly *and humbly confess all thy sins*, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.' [This blessing is like the whole scheme,—to establish entire control over the laity:—a key to their inmost thoughts; abject slavery to their father confessor.] After which, he says the Confiteor, as far as '*Mea Culpa*,' &c. then accuses himself of *all his sins, as to their kind, number, and aggravating circumstances*; and concludes with this, or the like form: 'of these, and all other sins of my whole life, I humbly accuse myself, and *beg pardon of God, and absolution of you, my ghostly father*.'" And having finished the Confiteor, '*Therefore I beseech thee, &c.*' he attends to the instructions given by the priest, and humbly accepts the penance enjoined."

The conclusion is appropriate to the shameless distortion of Scripture by which we have seen it defended;—"Our Lord Jesus Christ absolve thee; and I, BY HIS AUTHORITY *absolve thee* from every bond of excommunication or interdict, [spiritual or Church fetters;] and, *I absolve thee from all thy sins*, in the name of the Father, &c." [This is taking God's name in vain, or to a lie.] "May the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the *MERITS of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of all the saints*; and *whatsoever good* THOU shalt do, or *whatsoever evil* thou shalt suffer, be unto thee the remission of thy sins, the increase of grace, and the recompense of everlasting life. Amen."

Thus does the priest, unlock the condemned cell, and free the sinner, by the Saviour, aided by the merits of Mary, and all saints, *and of the sinner himself!*

Such are the Pope's picklocks, by which he robs the treasury of Christ's merits, and puts in penances, saints, &c., as exchanges for our sins against God—as if the blood of Jesus Christ his Son, did *not* cleanse from all sin !

And what is the purpose of all these forgeries, for every passage of Scripture quoted, is dragged in as no honest man dare torture other books? No cases of *such* confession to the Apostles are adduced ; not even any such confession to Christ himself.

But the whole is a bold attempt to rob the world of liberty, by first depriving men of all common sense.

Men who voluntarily submit to this, may not feel it an invasion ; but they are enslaved nevertheless ; no thought can be hidden ; subjects on which no modest men would open their lips to each other, are the subjects of enquiry in the confessional, without distinction of age or sex. Students of theology, have to master the vilest questions ; weigh sins in scales, and add enormity to enormity, circumstance to circumstance, to decide to a grain, whether they be mortal or venial ; and how much satisfaction is due unto God !

Thus are their minds polluted beforehand, that they may not blush in polluting others. For "it is a shame to speak of the things done by them in secret."

This is the spiritual police, tracking men into the haunts of vice and the privacies of home, that all pollutions may be poured into the sacred ears of a priest. And even thoughts or intentions, entertained but a moment, and banished in shame from the mind, are carried to this sink of iniquity.

Forms of sin which might not enter the mind, are suggested by the priest, and so the penitent is taught immorality from those who have made it a science in order to apply the salve of the Church, or the lash of penance. An intolerable slavery, as degrading to man, as it is insulting to our God and Saviour ! Thus are men bound and loosed, bound to the chair of the Pope, and loosed from the throne of Christ.

II. We have next to compare these pretensions and picklocks with the true keys of Peter ; and the proper method of "binding and loosing." Some confine the keys to the simple fact of Peter first preaching the gospel on the day of Pentecost ; concluding that in this sense alone Christ gave to him the keys ; whilst all the Apostles received the power of "binding and loosing," which is regarded by them as a matter distinct from the keys.

We have already given our reasons for a different explanation ; namely that the keys were the *instructions* by which our Lord let the Apostles into the nature of his kingdom. Not the commencement or formation of a Church ; but the knowledge of the new constitution which Christ came to establish.

With this knowledge we also associate "binding and loosing," that is laying down those laws, according to which men are to be guided ;—*the terms of salvation*.

This phrase "binding and loosing," was a law term of the Jews,—meaning to enforce or annul certain requirements ; making some binding, setting others aside ; or loosing men from them.

And this was the work of the Apostles;—to teach us what is binding and what is not binding, in the kingdom of heaven. In other words,—to lay down the *principles of the New Testament constitution*, On which as on the Apostles, the Church was to be built.

“Binding and loosing” was no personal authority in the Apostles; nothing left to their discretion: but the simple declaration of Christ’s commands; teaching men the true way of salvation. But this key of knowledge binding and loosing men, by teaching a new law, priests (as of old,) have tried to hide; **AND THE GREATEST CONTEST, HAS BEEN BETWEEN THE BIBLE AND THE CHURCH.** That is; between the Bible and the priesthood, falsely called the Church.

It was to the Apostles, and to none else, that our Lord gave the office of declaring his will; and it was at his dictation, that they bound and loosed, retained and remitted sins: that is, laid down the nature of Christian duty; and declared the terms of forgiveness. What they thus laid down, is now ratified in heaven, and woe is unto those priests who destroy the charter of our privileges!

The effect of their locks and keys, is admirably described in Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*; whilst the same instance teaches on what principle the Apostles have bound and loosed.

Christian and Hopeful had wandered from the king’s highway, and “could not get back to the stile that night,” so they lay down to rest near to “a castle called Doubting Castle, the owner whereof was Giant Despair; and it was on his grounds they were now sleeping.” The Giant finding them thus trespassing on his territory, “drove them before him, and put them into his castle, in a very dark dungeon, nasty and stinking to the spirits of these two men.” Here they lay for some time, “without one bit of bread, or drop of drink, or (any) light.” And afterwards were grievously ill-treated by the said Giant. Who however, was occasionally powerless, for in sun-shiny weather he fell into fits, and lost the use of his hands. *He could not bear the full clear light of the sun:* his castle was the stronghold of darkness.

This tyrant after tormenting his prisoners for some time, declared they should never escape, and so recommended as the best remedy that they should make away with themselves.

“Well, on Saturday, about midnight, they began to pray, and continued in prayer till almost break of day.

Now a little before it was day, good Christian, as one half amazed, brake out into this passionate speech:—what a fool, quoth he, am I, thus to lie in a stinking dungeon, *when I may as well walk at liberty! I have a KEY in my bosom, called PROMISE*, that will, I am persuaded, *OPEN ANY LOCK in Doubting Castle*. Then said Hopeful, that’s good news, brother, *pluck it out of thy bosom*. Then Christian pulled it out of his bosom, and began to try at the dungeon-door, whose bolt, as he turned the key, gave back and the door flew open with ease, and Christian and Hopeful both came out. Then he went to the outward door that leads into the castle-yard, and with his key opened that door also. After that, he went to the iron gate, for that must be opened too, but that lock went desperately hard; *yet the key did open it*. Then they thrust open the gate to make their escape with speed; but that gate as it opened made

such a creaking, that it waked Giant Despair, who hastily rising to pursue *his prisoners*, felt his limbs to fail, for his fits took him again, so that he could by no means go after them. Then they went on, and came to the KING'S HIGHWAY, and so were safe, because they were out of his (the Giant's) jurisdiction."

The Pope and all usurping Priests, are that Giant Despair; the castle in which they lock men up, is the darkness of ignorance, shutting out the light of truth, darkening it by tradition and Church power: the key to unlock the cell door, and the outer gate, is the PROMISE OF SALVATION BY JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

This is the true use of Peter's key:—to employ the "exceeding great and precious promises" mentioned in his Epistle, (2 Pet. i. 4.) as the means of our deliverance from the condemned cell. This will deliver us from the Pope, from Satan, and from our own sinfulness: for "God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, by turning away every one of you from his iniquities.—(Acts iii. 26.)

This is one great part of the binding and loosing, binding us to Christ, and loosing us from all besides.

The commission of the Saviour to his Apostles was to publish the gospel, which they were to receive from him; and whatever they thus announced; what they laid down as the law, Christ would enforce: what they gave as a promise, he would fulfil: it is all ratified in heaven. And as the angel struck off Peter's chains, so the gospel was to loose men from Satan's thralldom; not that they should go down the *crooked paths* of monkish morality, and read new tables of sins; but walk erect along *the street which is called straight*, after Jesus Christ our great emancipator.

What therefore they did when they bound and loosed,—was to declare the law:—*to LOOSE the bonds of a Jewish ritual and priestly servitude, and BIND the sweet yoke of Christ on our shoulders.*

If men were in carelessness and sin, they were to bind this law upon them—"but now God commandeth all men everywhere to repent:" if men were pricked to the heart, and desirous of salvation, they were loosed on this principle which is ratified in heaven—"believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."

If men continued impenitent, then this law is binding, "he that believeth not shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."

And thus whose soever sins the Apostles by this gospel law have remitted; those are remitted in heaven; whose soever sins by those laws are retained, are retained in heaven. So that we have not to go to priests, *to none of whom Christ has given power to absolve from sins*; but to the Apostles, whose writings are the gospel; and the laws of which are ratified by Christ,—bound in heaven.

No minister in the world, and no Church in the world, has power to forgive sins; *the form of absolution, is a blasphemous forgery*: a minister is no more than another man; Christ gives him no power, no authority at all: no Church has any power in these matters; all that any one can do is to tell men what Christ has said by his Holy Apostles and Prophets.

The *Apostles never forgave any sins*; nor was it intended they should do so: they only told men how Christ had undertaken to save us from wrath,—by repentance towards God and faith in himself: they never

received a private confession from any one, and never say anything about such a procedure!

The whole purpose of our Lord's assurance to the Apostles, *was to make the gospel valid to us; and TO MAKE US QUITE INDEPENDENT OF PRIESTS.*

He says, whose soever sins YE (my Apostles) remit, they are remitted: whatsoever duties ye lay down, they are my law; and therefore whosoever takes your word, is safe, whatsoever any pretending priests say to the contrary.

I commission YOU, not them, to declare my law: and you *can have no successors*, for I HAVE NO LAW TO SUCCEED THIS: the gospel is ever the same: it rests on the Apostles and Prophets, not on priests.

Would you know then,—whose sins are remitted? Look into the promises of the gospel, given by Apostles, and ratified by the Saviour. Would you know whose sins are retained? Examine their declarations,—the law they have made binding on the world; the only law by which we shall be tried before the judgment seat of Christ.

This is the meaning of being "bound in heaven;" the sentence of the Apostles in the New Testament, about each one of us, will stand good and be carried out at the last great day.

Here is your true "table of sins," and of mercies: all else is false: here is your true ground of absolution, all else is a delusion.

If you have believed in Christ, then the Apostle's law has remitted your sins; for "ye are saved from wrath through him." "There is henceforth *now* no condemnation, to them that are in Christ Jesus;"—this key unlocks the door of the spiritual inquisition, and makes us free in Christ's name. And that is above every name; it is above the Pope's name; who is not Christ's vicar, but an impostor.

Christ has no Vicar; no one can take his place; CHRIST IS OUR VICAR; he takes our place: he does our work for us; and can do his own work.

The Pope pretends to be Vicar of Christ, Vicar of Paul, and Vicar of Peter: none of them need any such officious help: Paul and Peter finished their work; and it remains as our certain and infallible guide: Christ is now himself in this world; and therefore can need no Vicar, who can only be an usurper. His law is laid down by his authorized Apostles:—the goodness and severity of God; remitting and retaining sins; remitting the sins of those who believe, retaining the sins of those who are disobedient. And what they have declared Christ will ratify in heaven, and carry out at the judgment day. What sentence then have the Apostles recorded respecting us? If we are now in bondage; they have given us the key that we may escape; and flee for refuge to the Saviour.

III. There may still be in the minds of some, a difficulty in understanding why the keys were given to Peter by name, so prominently, instead of to any of the other Apostles. And therefore (though this difficulty has no tendency to give force to the claims of the Pope—who is not Peter) we may attempt in conclusion to clear up this question.

1. These words—"I give unto *thee* the keys"—were addressed to Peter, first because he was generally foremost,—the spokesman for the

company ; he spoke for the rest, and therefore received an answer for the rest. "Whom say *ye* that I am," this was our Lord's question to *ALL the disciples* ; Peter answered for them ; and therefore received the keys for them,—that is, a promise that they should *know all about Christ*,—the subject to which they had not yet found the key or explanation. The whole paragraph (Matt. xvi. 13—20) is upon the important question,—"what think ye of the Christ?" And to the disciples it was given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God ; who the Saviour was, and what constitution he would establish ; but this knowledge, was at first only imperfectly given even to the disciples : who were not during the Saviour's life to use the keys, in preaching the gospel. Hence, though he promised them the keys, and partly fulfilled the promise by acknowledging Peter's confession, he concludes this paragraph, by charging "his disciples that *they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ*."

This therefore was what the keys referred to ;—letting the disciples (and afterwards the world through them) into the secret about the Redeemer's person and office. And because (though all were asked the question) Peter being forward *answered for them*, the promise was made to him, but for the rest.

I have now acknowledged partly, what I am, and you shall yet have the keys,—to know fully : but at present, do not tell the people what little you have learned, for the time is not yet fully come.

These circumstances therefore properly estimated shew both why the keys were given to Peter, and what they refer to ;—the nature and office of Christ, or his kingship.

The forwardness of Peter, is manifest in many instances ;—when our Lord washed his disciples feet, the rest submitted in silence ; but Peter exclaimed—"dost thou wash *my* feet?" The answer to this question was personal in its form, but universal in its principle ; "unless I wash *thee* thou hast no part with me."—(John xiii. 1—8.)

Is it then supposed from this saying to Peter, that only *he* was washed ; that only *he* has a part with the Redeemer? No! All will acknowledge that *here* an answer addressed to Peter, is to *every person*. And therefore no monopoly can be founded on any such form of speech. The keys are given now to all men,—since the Apostles though commanded to be silent on the nature or work of Christ, while he lived, were after his death commanded to preach the gospel for every creature. In other words to publish the keys. And now *it is given to all men, to know the mysteries of the kingdom* ;—if they are desirous of knowing them. It is a universal privilege : and the labour of the Apostle to the Gentiles, was to make all men know the mystery—the divine purpose of salvation by Jesus Christ.

The only reason why the knowledge of this mystery was first promised to Peter, (under the name of the keys to intimate the unlocking of what had been "hidden in the mind of God for ages,")—the reason for this seeming preference was—because Peter with his usual eagerness spoke first, and so was answered for the rest, in whose name he had spoken. "Whom say *YE* (disciples) that I am? Peter answered and said, (*we say**) thou art the Christ the Son of the living God."

* This insertion "we say," is required to make Peter's answer consistent with the question, and with the silence of the others who tacitly allowed his answer.

The same eagerness of Peter, which made him answer for the rest in this instance, is exhibited in the fact that while John was fearful, Peter entered into the Sepulchre; the disciples forsook Christ and fled; Peter followed into the palace of the high priest: he was eager, generous, and rash; he drew his sword, and cut off an ear of the high priest's servant. Everything recorded of him, is consistent with this tendency. The others heard in sorrowful silence our Lord's declaration that he must be crucified; Peter said, "that be far from thee Lord," and so he received that rebuke which belongs to his pretended successors; who have his faults without his excellencies, whose ambition is cool and calculating, not a noble impulse; and who have not like Peter repented of their apostacy.

When all were amazed at the transfiguration, Peter must speak, though he did not know what he said: when it was declared that all would deny their Lord, Peter must declare, though all forsake thee, yet will not I; he would die with Christ rather than deny him. Thus did Peter become distinguished to his shame and sorrow.

2. And this leads to the second reason why Peter was so marked by our Lord, in the promise of the keys;—namely, because the Saviour foresaw that Peter would deny him; and therefore he in mercy caused Peter to be recognized, even though for a time an apostate. "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." Hence the message sent by the angel from the tomb—"go your way, tell *his disciples and Peter* that he goeth before you into Galilee."—(Mark xvi. 7.) What is the meaning of this, "*his disciples and Peter*," as if Peter were not one of them? Without strong assurances to the contrary, he could hardly consider himself now a disciple: yet how lovingly and earnestly he had visited the Sepulchre, not willing to give up the Saviour whom in an evil hour he had denied!

The other Apostles might reasonably have rejected Peter, (as many at first feared to recognize Paul!) but here was an assurance, prepared beforehand—"I am to preach as well as you, he gave me the keys."

And this use of the keys by Peter is an emphatic lesson, *showing how wide is the door of salvation*; admitting even Peter who had denied his Lord, and therefore a proof that men may return to Christ, and be accepted, even after they have turned away from him. It was in this manner, by examples or instances, that our Lord taught us the extent of his saving power, "that in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace," by the agents he employed, and the characters he redeemed.

Accordingly *the Saviour* MADE THE MOST OF THE LEAST; exalted those whom we should be less likely to expect; as publicans and sinners; the thief on the cross; Saul the persecutor; Peter the apostate. The Apostle John, who appears before us as a constant, and loving disciple, received none of these public marks of favour and prominence, as to his position in the new kingdom: but private marks of regard, and (except at the crucifixion) generally given privately.

But Peter is especially marked to shew the forbearance and mercy of the Saviour:—"tell his disciples and Peter"—yes, that Peter who denied me, for I let him fall to check his boldness, and now lift him up again to shew how far my mercy can reach.

If we had not been favoured with the teaching of this example, *one class of men would be left to despair*: namely those who have denied Christ; and this is a very large class. For who has not on some occasions, held his allegiance to the Saviour in abeyance? Have we not all denied him, on some occasion or other: have not all Christians cherished too much, an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from their Saviour and ruler? Have not many virtually abandoned him? Where then is the hope for such? We know that sinners may be saved, persecutors and malefactors can enter the door of mercy; but in Peter we find that even apostates also, those who in any way have denied Christ, will not be rejected when they sue for mercy. Several passages of Scripture seemed to tell against this:—"if we deny him, he also will deny us;"—(2 Tim. ii. 12.) "Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny, before my Father who is in heaven."—(Matt. x. 33.) Well Peter denied him, and we may also have done so in many ways; are we therefore lost—without hope of salvation? No! for Peter denied him, and was received back; to preach repentance towards God and faith in Jesus Christ. This was the true key, opening a wide door; and explaining the declaration of Christ, so as not to exclude for ever those who once deny him, but *only those who keep on denying him*. And therefore, he who "can save to the uttermost," will not reject any *who do not deny him to the last*;—any who ever return to him.

The same merciful instance, explains another fearful saying,—"*for if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins*; but a certain fearful looking for of judgment."—(Heb. x. 26, 27.) Who would not be condemned by the strictness of these words? But the sinning wilfully, like the denial of Christ, means *a continuance in such a course*; cherishing no desire to return to his favour; then there is *no more sacrifice*, NO OTHER SAVIOUR remaining: but if we return to him, we find that his sacrifice does remain, and will be sufficient for all who like Peter repent and return. So full of deep instruction is this word of life; such are the reasons for giving Peter a prominence, that like Paul and others, he should be a specimen of mercy:—not to awaken arrogance in sinful men, to Lord it over the Church and the whole world; but to give consolation to the vilest sinners; AND ENCOURAGE EVEN THE DENIERS OF CHRIST, TO BECOME SUCCESSORS OF PETER, BY RETURNING TO CHRIST.

III.

STATESMEN'S RELIGION.

"EVERY PLANT WHICH MY HEAVENLY FATHER HATH NOT PLANTED, SHALL BE ROOTED UP."—(Matt. xv. 13.)

In those who think a national Church right, dissent is a sin ; in those who think it wrong, silence is a shame.

THE HOUSE OF MERCHANTIZE.

"And the Jews' passover was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem and found in the temple those that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money sitting : and when *he had made a scourge of small cords*, he drove them all out of the temple ; and the sheep and the oxen ; and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables : and said unto them that sold doves, take these things hence ; *make not my Father's house a house of merchandize.*"—(John ii. 14—16.)

No doubt our Lord was frequently set down as very *harsh* in his conduct, and *pre-eminently bitter in the spirit* exhibited in his *denunciations*. His words were such as cannot be equalled in severity of invective, when dealing with "Scribes and Pharisees, and hypocrites !" who for a pretence made long prayers and for a practice devoured widows' houses. He reserved his mildness and gentleness for publicans and sinners, men who made no pretensions, and confessed their sinfulness.

This point in our Lord's character has yet to be made prominent in its relation to our present public affairs ; and to all reformation and abuses.

The grand argument of nearly all defenders of abuses, is to CONDEMN THE *bitterness with which they are exposed*: the point is invariably assumed,—that the reformer is of a bad spirit, and hence he is warned to consider "*the meekness and gentleness of Christ.*" They are never told to imitate Christ's *whip of small cords* ; never to imitate his unsparing exposures, and powerful rebukes of *whited sepulchres ; serpents, generations of vipers, children of the Devil !*

This part of our Lord's spirit, is ignored ; and hence the smooth speaking now required, so contrary to the plain speaking of the gospel. Every expression condemnatory of existing evils, is by their abettors set down for a violation of Christian meekness ; so charitable are they in enforcing charity. Men who love abuses, become quite warm against the unchristian bitterness which reproves them.

But supposing the advocates of reform, were as bold and denunciatory in their invectives, as they are ungenerously assumed to be ; it would not

therefore follow that their style is contrary to the style and spirit of Christ.

As there are two aspects of the divine nature,—the wrath of God, and the righteousness of God ; his justice and mercy ; *severity and goodness* ; as the gospel itself, is full of the tenderest mercy, and yet contains the most awful warnings,—a responsibility terrible in proportion to the privileges of love offered ;—*so the personal character of our blessed Redeemer*, who is the express image of the Father, and an embodiment of the principles of the gospel, CONTAINS THESE TWO ELEMENTS, OF SEVERITY AND GOODNESS.

Therefore, to exhibit “the spirit of Christ,” is to combine his powerful condemnation of abuses and their supporters, with the gentlest commiseration for the unfortunate, the outcast, the penitent profligate and felon. “Then *in the audience of all the people*, he said unto his disciples, beware of the Scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and love greetings in the markets, and the highest seats in the synagogues, and the chief rooms at feasts ; which devour widows’ houses, and for a shew make long prayers : the same shall receive greater damnation.”—(LukE xx. 45—47.) Here is ridicule of their dress, and manners ; exposing their motives, and denunciation of their doom.

Their long robes and their long prayers ; their high seats,—high titles, and their low practices ; and finally a solemn declaration of their danger. This was the spirit of Christ, to such men. On the contrary, to any who wearied of this or any other sinful course, were looking for refuge and peace ;—he would say come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest. He was meek and lowly in heart, and yet unsparing in condemning the characters even of the public and authorized teachers of the Jews—“blind leaders of the blind.”

It follows therefore that no measure of invective against what is wrong, is any violation of Christian meekness. We write not that it may be conceded to us ;—that we may act upon this licence given by our pattern,—indeed no one’s language could ever equal in condemnatory power, the language of the Redeemer, in his public discourses—“*in the audience to all the people.*” But these conditions, including the twofold element in the spirit of Christ according to the persons he was dealing with ; may serve to moderate the warmth of those who first presume upon the bitterness of reformers, and then condemn them for it ; as a display of Christian mildness.

This is a subject into which we shall enter more fully on some other occasion,—to exhibit the true spirit of Christ, in his dealings with penitents and with hardened sinners, whether deceiving or being deceived.

For the present we may obviate one natural objection to this argument ; viz :—“that Christ knew men’s hearts, and so could infallibly denounce their conduct : but we have not this knowledge.” Be it so ; then do not denounce reformers as wicked and bitter ; till you have such knowledge. Do not impugn their motives without any evidence but your own prejudice ; nor condemn their style of actions, without knowing anything of either.

But further, our Lord did teach us, how to distinguish such characters :—not by our prejudices, not by reports, but “*by their fruits shall*

YE *know them.*" So that it is a safe rule to point out men's actions, and from these infer their principles; and praise or denounce them accordingly. It is probable that our Lord was condemned as a *reproachful vituperative person*; speaking evil of dignities, from "that Fox" on the throne to those "hypocrites" in the synagogue; he could let nobody alone; nothing was good enough for him; he seemed to come into the world only to find fault; it was no wonder they crucified him; he did not take the shortest method of drawing followers. True indeed! He repelled men, till they were far enough off to take a fair view of him; when he was near they did not know him; but having crucified him, they knew his value; as they stood afar off, and smote their breasts, returning home in silence from that scene of popular delusion and priestly craft; then they considered his true character: and he *when he was lifted up*, drew men unto him.

So it has been with his own true martyrs since; they win their crown by suffering and obloquy, and gain their followers after crucifixion.

To speak now of God's house, being a "house of merchandize," or to use the still stronger words of Christ,—A DEN OF THIEVES;" would be to expose the writer or speaker to this reproach of violating Christ's spirit, in following his example. *And yet there is greater sin in what we have to expose, than in what Christ condemned.* Those who sold doves in the Jewish Temple, could make a better apology, than those who pollute the Church of Christ, by the merchandize of spiritual offices.

Those men sold doves for sacrifices; *they did not sell the priests' promotions*: "the tables of the money-changers," were not so vile as the "CHURCH REGISTRIES" set up in our country and supported by patrons of livings, and Christian clergymen.

What would the Redeemer have said, if he had found the following on the tables?

SALES OF CHURCH PROPERTY, &c.

CHURCH PREFERMENT.

FOR SALE, the NEXT PRESENTATION to a PERPETUAL CURACY, in a Midland County, *with the prospect of an early avoidance.*

The income is 170*l.* at present, and will annually increase, (in a way that will be explained,) till it attains to about 190*l.*; and there is a good Parsonage House, with Garden, Pleasure Grounds, and convenient Out-offices.

For price and further particulars, apply to Mr. Garbitt, Land Agent, Lawley, near Wellington, Salop.—(*Midland Counties Herald*, June, 1849.)

The traders in the Temple of Jerusalem did not go so far as this: or they would have received a more severe condemnation.

We shall invite our readers to a walk, about the tables of the money-changers, in our modern English Temple; that they may see how much need there is *for Christ to come again*, in the power of his truth, which is a scourge of small cords."

The Record, (Jan. 3, 1849,) the organ of the evangelical party in the

Church of England, contained the four following advertisements in the following order; the first of them is peculiarly worthy of notice, as indicating THE SYSTEM to which the *property in livings* is subject.

THE CHURCH REGISTRY.

THE business of this Office (late of 10, Norfolk-street, Strand,) for the sale and exchange of Advowsons and Next Presentations, the obtaining of Curacies with or without Titles to Orders, &c., is now conducted at 14, Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn, London, where all communications may be addressed to H. Robinson, Registrar.—January 1, 1849.

NEXT PRESENTATION of a RECTORY in a favourite part of Lancashire TO BE SOLD. Annual value 843*l.*, with a rectorial house and second residence for a curate. *The present Incumbent is in his eighty-third year.*

For particulars apply to Messrs. Bell, Steward, and Lloyd, solicitors, of 59, Lincoln's-inn-fields, London.

THE NEXT PRESENTATION to a desirable LIVING, is TO BE DISPOSED OF on moderate terms, and *with very early possession*. It is situated in a most desirable part and neighbourhood in a midland county, the population nearly 1,000, and the present value 150*l.* a-year, but it is capable of improvement. It may be strongly recommended, either to a clergyman who is entirely devoted to his duties, or who combines tuition with them. He must be of sound Church and Evangelical sentiments, and give satisfactory references. Letters may be directed (pre-paid) to A. B., at the Office of the Record.

MARLBOROUGH COLLEGE.

A PRESENTATION, value 50*l.*, available for February next, TO BE DISPOSED OF. As the College accounts are paid in advance, the half year ending Midsummer, 1849, must be paid to the Secretary on or before the 15th January, to the account of School number 209.

Application for the presentation to be made to the Rev. S. I. G. Sandgate, Folkestone.

The unlearned reader will be pleased to bear in mind, that "the eighty-third year" of "the present incumbent," is a *saleable property*, being equivalent to the "prospect of an early possession." This doctrine has been severely commented on by those not understanding its spiritual nature; as the following instance will sufficiently indicate.

"A CURE OF SOULS FOR SALE.—Notice has been given that the perpetual advowson and next presentation to the vicarage of Braintree is for sale, and as an *inducement to purchasers*, it is stated that the present incumbent is in his 79th year. Braintree is a town in Essex, the large majority of the inhabitants being dissenters, who have for many years past resisted church rates, and who originated a case which has frequently come under the consideration of our courts of judicature. The present patron of the living is the Rev. J. Lewis, M.A. rector of Ingateston and Rivinhall, the value of whose united benefices (Braintree not included) is 1,151*l.* per annum."—(*Daily News*, April 29, 1850.)

It should however be known by our readers, that there is nothing irre-

gular or indelicate in this method of intimating the age of the incumbent; especially as this is one item in the bargain.

The following little property was advertised in September, 1850, and contains the same specification as to age.

IMPORTANT SALE OF HIGHLY VALUABLE CHURCH PREFERMENT.

TO be SOLD by AUCTION, at the Warren Bulkeley Arms Hotel, in Stockport, in numerous lots, in the month of September inst., of which due notice will be given—the NEXT PRESENTATION to the valuable Rectories of St. Mary and St. Thomas, in the parish of Stockport, of the estimated value of nearly 2,500*l.* a year, the present Incumbent being in his sixty-fourth year.

If this important article of trade were laid aside, the occupations connected with it would be destroyed or injured; such as the following:

TO MEMBERS OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION, TRUSTEES,
EXECUTORS, AND THE PUBLIC IN GENERAL.

MR. MARSH'S (late Fuller and Marsh) PERIODICAL SALES, established in 1843, of Absolute and Contingent Reversions to Money in the Funds, Freehold, Copyhold, and Leasehold Estates, and all descriptions of Reversionary Interests, *Advowsons, next Presentations, Rent Charges in lieu of Tithes, and Ecclesiastical Property*, Life Interests, Policies of Assurance, Ground and improved Rents, Shares in Railways, Canals, Fire and Life Insurance Companies, Mines and all Public Undertakings, Debentures, Post Obit Bonds, &c., &c., take place at the Auction Mart, (opposite the Bank of England,) London, on the First Thursday in each Month.

Mr. M's Fee for offering each lot (excepting in special cases, Shares, &c.,) is 2½ Guineas, which includes all expenses of advertising, printing, &c., and a scale of commission according to the amount when a sale is effected.

2, Charlotte Row, Mansion House, London. Nov. 1850.

Should any of our friends be disposed to speculate, the following rare bargain is still in the market; so that a favourable opportunity occurs for buying a share in the Church; which is a steady business, whilst Railways are fluctuating.

MESSRS. FAREBROTHER, CLARK, and LYE are instructed to OFFER for SALE, at the Royal Hotel, Leeds, on Thursday, the 10th day of October next, and following day, at Twelve o'clock each day, in numerous lots, (under an order of the High Court of Chancery, made in the Cause "*Brandling v. Plummer*," and with the approbation of the Hon. Sir George Rose, one of the Masters of the said Court)—the valuable Freehold Manor of Middleton, with Three Residences, known as "*Middleton Hall*," "*Middleton Lodge*," and "*Middleton Grange Park*," Lands, and well arranged Farms, with suitable Buildings, the whole about 1,600 Acres, in Meadow, Pasture, and Wood Lands, with the Tithes of other Lands in the parish, commuted at 7*l.* 8*s.* 6*d.* per annum; the well-known Middleton Collieries, within three miles of the important

town of Leeds, and near to the Leeds and Bradford Railway; also, the Advowson of the Vicarage of Rothwell, the Tithes being commuted at upwards of 900*l.* per annum.

This advowson, though advertised in September last, is offered to capitalists this year.

MESSRS. FAREBROTHER, CLARK, and LYE will SELL by AUCTION, at Garraways Coffee House, Change Alley, London, the Advowson to the Living of Irnham-cum-corby, with Parsonage House, Twenty-six Acres of Glebe Land, a Farm, and the Commuted Tithe, yielding about 950*l.* per annum.

These gentlemen seem long to have had a difficulty in providing a customer for the good thing announced above. But our readers must choose for themselves, since they will find many eligible offers.

The splendid Freehold Domain and Manors of Gayhurst and Stoke Goldington, near Newport Pagnell, on the high road to Northampton, only about four miles from the Wolverton Station, with its noble Mansion, rich and finely timbered Park, and fertile Meadows, bounded for a considerable extent by a beautiful reach of the River Ouse; also the Perpetual Advowson of the united Rectories of Gayhurst and Stoke; several compact Farms, fine Woodlands, thickly stored with Oak and intersected by handsome broad turf rides, altogether about 2,500 Acres, in a ring fence, forming one of the most desirable seats in the county, in a famous sporting neighbourhood, only 2½ hours journey from town, combining also a choice and solid landed investment.

MESSRS. DANIEL SMITH and SON are commissioned to SUBMIT to PUBLIC COMPETITION, at the Auction Mart, London, on Friday, July 26th, at Twelve, (unless an acceptable offer shall be previously made by Private Treaty)—the above distinguished and very valuable Freehold Estate; together with the Manors, (co-extensive with the two parishes,) and the Perpetual Advowson of the Rectories of Gayhurst and Stoke Goldington, with its excellent Parsonage and Glebe Farm; and an extensive Fishery in the River Ouse, which bounds a considerable portion of the Demesne Lands, and on the bank of which is an Ornamental Bath and Cottage, interspersed with some beautiful Woodlands full of thriving Oak and other Timber, and forming admirable Preserves for Game; together with the greater part of the small Village of Stoke Goldington, *including the Two neat little Inns, and other Premises.* The situation can scarcely be surpassed; it is on the high road between the towns of Newport Pagnell, Olney, and Northampton, *a perfectly agricultural and healthy residential neighbourhood, within a few miles of the regular meets of Lord Southampton's, Mr. Lowndes', and the Oakley Hounds, and within the reach of the Pytchley Hunt,* only ten miles from Northampton, twelve from Bedford, and within a few miles of the Wolverton and Bletchley Stations on the North-Western Railway.

The above is eclipsed by the subjoined interesting situation, amidst plenty of fishing as well as splendid hunting, together with "*a population not exceeding ten persons;*" so that *the duty is light.*

Both were in the market but a little time ago, and perhaps neither is disposed of at present.

The important ESTATE of BROOKSBY HALL, a choice Hunting Seat, near Melton Mowbray, about ten miles from Leicester and Loughborough, embracing one of the richest domains in that proverbially fertile district, with a comfortable Stone Mansion, on a moderate scale, with the MANOR, FISHERY, and PERPETUAL ADVOWSON, a MILL, and WHARF, and several famous FARMS in Brooksby and Hoby, intersected for upwards of a mile by the River Wreak, presenting an unusually fine property for Investment.

MESSRS. DANIEL SMITH and SON will SUBMIT to AUCTION, at the Mart, London, on July 26th, at Twelve, (unless an acceptable offer shall be previously made by Private Treaty)—the *above remarkably choice and most valuable Freehold Estate, comprising in a ring fence, about 1,150 Acres of exceedingly rich Grazing Land, capable of fattening the largest bullocks, with a range of luxuriant meadows, intersected by the river, and a fine breadth of sound fertile Arable Land, the greater part in the hands of first-class Tenants, and, with little exception, in the finest state of cultivation. The Mansion, of which possession may be had, stands upon a gentle rise, close to the beautiful little Church of Brooksby, surrounded by some exceedingly rich park-like Paddocks, studded with very handsome Timber and beautiful springs of Water. The Manor of Brooksby, with an extensive Fishery, also the Perpetual Advowson of the Rectory, with the right of next presentation, are attached to the Estate, rendering it altogether a most complete and desirable Property.* From its extraordinary sound, deep rich soil, and from its being subject to comparatively trifling poor rates, (the *population of Brooksby not exceeding ten or twelve persons,*) and *exonerated of land tax and tithes, it is an unusually eligible and choice Estate as an investment*; and being in the midst of several *favourite hunts, and within a short ride of Leicester, with a Railway Station adjoining the Estate, bringing it within four hours' journey of London, and connecting it with most parts of England, it is also a most attractive and desirable residential Property.*

The Estate may be viewed by application to Mr. Simpkin, the principal Tenant; and descriptive particulars, with plans, may be obtained of Messrs. Delmar and Wynne, Solicitors, 46, Lincoln's Inn Fields; or of Messrs. Daniel Smith and Son, Land Agents, in Waterloo Place, Pall Mall, London.

The same Agents also announced, (with the above) the following for "*Public Competition*;"

THE important FREEHOLD ESTATE, of CAMERTON COURT, in a picturesque part of Somersetshire, only seven miles from Bath; comprising an elegant modern MANSION, replete with every suitable appendage, and in the most perfect keeping and delightful order, surrounded by a beautiful, dry healthy Park, richly varied with Plantations and Woodlands. Also, the Manors, and the most desirable *Perpetual Advowson of the Living, (with the prospect of very early possession;*) and several well-conditioned Farms, and a very valuable Colliery, on

Lease. The whole of the annual value of upwards of 3,000*l.* exclusive of the delightful and complete Residence.

The incumbent would seem to be *very* old, or *very* ill; since there was a "prospect of very early possession."

AND SURELY A DELICATE MAN WOULD BE ASHAMED TO LIVE LONG AFTER HIS LIVING HAD BEEN SOLD; especially when this "prospect" was presented so cheerfully to the successor.

The following tempting offer to a "fellow labourer," "of evangelical views and a good voice;" is of a different nature; but instinctive as to the prospects of those who have only good qualities to secure promotion. The Advertisement appeared in *the Record*.

CURACY, WITH OR WITHOUT A TITLE.

A CURACY is offered to a fellow-labourer, of Evangelical views, with good voice, and active habits in visiting the sick, poor, schools, &c. There is a very good house and garden, with stables, &c., in addition to which a stipend of 40*l.* would be given, with a title. To a person already in orders an additional stipend.

Apply (post paid) to Vicarius, Post-office, Newport Pagnell, Bucks.

We hope the Curate's "fellow" had a better income than 40*l.*, for his voice and active habits; or they would both require to be visited as amongst "the poor:" but perhaps the advertiser had "an additional stipend," through his "*Title*."

The next advertisement from the same paper (*Record*, May, 1848,) is in every way more tempting.

SUFFOLK ADVOWSON.

TO be SOLD by AUCTION, by MESSRS. COLCHESTER & SON, at the White Horse Inn, Ipswich, Suffolk, on Friday the 9th day of June, 1848, at Three o'clock in the Afternoon, the Perpetual Advowson and Next Presentation to the Vicarage of Mendlesham, which is endowed with one-third of the great or rectorial tithes of the parish, which, with the vicarial tithes, have been commuted at 583*l.* 13*s.* The vicarage-house is a substantial and conveniently-arranged residence, very pleasantly situated in a lawn. There are about twenty-five Acres of Glebe Land. *The incumbent is in his fiftieth year. Mendlesham is in a highly respectable neighbourhood*, about seven miles from Stowmarket, through which the railroad runs from London to Bury, passing through Ipswich, from whence Mendlesham is about fifteen miles.

The property may be viewed and particulars obtained of Messrs. Smith and Son, solicitors, 16, Southampton-street, Bloomsbury-square; of Messrs Cavell and Son, solicitors, Saxmundham, Suffolk; and of the auctioneers, Ipswich.

The incumbent is fifty, the neighbourhood respectable, and the income more than the untitled Curate's.

Those of more moderate views, might be content with "the Advowson and Vicarage of Oadby, of which the income is about 270*l.* a-year," as lately advertised by Messrs. Daniel Smith and Son.

This notice of a desire for an "exchange," is exceedingly modest, and like all these advertisements, shews how much the laity are con-

sulted, in ecclesiastical arrangements: except when alarm is excited against the Pope.

EXCHANGE.

THE INCUMBENT of a district parish in the suburbs of London (value upwards of 500*l.* per annum) is desirous of effecting an EXCHANGE with a clergyman of Evangelical sentiments, for a living in an agricultural part of the country, *with a small population.*

The following is ambiguous :

THE INCUMBENT of a country living, in a midland county, population 1,600, income 140*l.* and *house capable of considerable increase*, is willing to EXCHANGE with a clergyman of Evangelical sentiments, for a town living, with an extended sphere of labour and proportionate increase of income.

Address, H. I. B. Post-office, Richmond, Yorkshire.

We should suppose according to the "plain grammatical sense," that it is *the house* which is capable of considerable increase; but it may be large enough already: if the incumbent mean the *income*, he had better increase it himself, and then make a more advantageous bargain.

But no one can complain of an advertisement like the following which appeared in the *Record*, with this capital heading:

A POOR LIVING WANTED.

A CLERGYMAN, of Evangelical views, who can give satisfactory references, wishes for an APPOINTMENT to a church in a town in the province of Canterbury. Advertiser's sole object being to obtain a permanent sphere of extended usefulness, he would gladly accept any such incumbency, if the situation be healthy, however small the income.

Address (pre-paid,) Rev. H. Parr, Higher Tranmere, Birkenhead.

We should suppose that any who want a "poor living," need only appeal to a curate. The "wants" expressed by ecclesiastical advertisements are somewhat varied: here is a gentleman describing himself as *paid for doing nothing*: so he wants a curate to *do all* the work, and get part of the pay.

WANTED, by *the non-resident incumbent* of a small agricultural parish near Tetbury, in Gloucestershire, a married CURATE, in full orders. The stipend is 100*l.* with the surplice fees, and the use of the Rectory House.

Clergymen of sound Evangelical principles may address inquiries to J. B. Post-office, Tetbury.

It may never have occurred to this non-resident incumbent, that it was possible to give up the living altogether; but another incumbent advertises in still greater distress, he wishes for "a faithful minister of the gospel to whom he could confide *the care of ONE of his parishes*;" the idea of giving up some of them does not appear to have struck him. Accordingly he tells us

A N INCUMBENT is anxious to meet with a faithful minister of the Gospel, to whom he could *confide the care of one of his parishes.* Population about 500. To one not altogether dependent upon the fruit

of his labours, the sphere is likely to prove a pleasant one. None whose views coincide with what is now known as Tractarianism need apply. Only such communications will be answered as shall appear likely to lead to an engagement. A title can be given.

Letters to be addressed (pre-paid,) Rev. M. A., care of Messrs. Mudie, 15, Coventry-street, Haymarket.

The following specimens of spiritual traffic we leave to the judgment of our readers.

PERPETUAL ADVOWSON WANTED.

WANTED to PURCHASE, the PERPETUAL ADVOWSON of a LIVING. Preference will be given to the midland counties, and vicinity to a railroad a great desideratum. A *prospect of very early possession* indispensable. The advertising party guarantee the presentation to a clergyman of sound Evangelical Protestant principles.

Address (pre-paid,) to W. M. P. W., 6 Robert-terrace, Chelsea.

WANTED to PURCHASE the ADVOWSON, or the right of next presentation to a rural endowed benefice, value from 140*l.* to about 400*l.* per annum. A house. Country preferred, but circumstances, *with prospect of early possession*, might influence.

Particulars by letter (post-paid,) to G. S., or to Messrs. Lovell, Gray's-inn.

TO be *SOLD*, the NEXT *PRESENTATION* to a small LIVING, situate in the beautiful and romantic neighbourhood of a good market town, in the county of Salop, and diocese of Hereford. There is a *prospect of early possession*. *Interest allowed*.

For particulars apply (pre-paid,) to Y. Z., at Messrs. Price and Bolton's, solicitors, 1, New-square, Lincoln's-inn, London.

Is it not humiliating to find such open and unblushing traffic in the spiritual concerns of this nation; making religion a property, putting up the cure of souls in an auction mart, turning the house of God into a house of merchandise and a den of thieves? Every party in the Church of England, high or low, Puseyite or Evangelical, is stained with this crying sin, and that in spite of restrictions and oaths,—restrictions that are evaded,—oaths that are interpreted into a form!

The law does not allow of a purchase of the next presentation, during a mortal sickness of the incumbent, nor after his decease; because it is supposed that in such cases the presentation would be bought for some specific individual, decided on beforehand; and thus be purchased *for him*,—not as a general spiritual trust. The statute law declares the right of presentation to be lost for that time in case any patron (the owner of the advowson) present a person for a sum of money or any profit. But this is always evaded by the patrons, as in the advertisements quoted *they sell another person the right of presenting*.

A young man wishes for a living, but must not buy the presentation of the patron; he lets his uncle, or father, or lawyer buy, and the lawyer, &c., *presents* him!

Thus there is real simony on all sides; but the statute law is evaded, or rather it is defied, for it is against that law to purchase the presenta-

tion with a view to give it to any particular person ; and is punishable *if this intention can be proved*, and if the person so intended becomes actually presented to the living* What *kind of evidence as to intention* is required by the law, is another question : but it is a matter of moral certainty, that the greater proportion of presentations thus purchased, are purchased (in opposition to the law) **WITH A VIEW TO PRESENT SOME PARTICULAR INDIVIDUAL.** Hence the special emphasis on the prospect of early possession—*because some one is waiting for the purchased living.*

Sometimes the intention is plainly avowed, (morally it can scarcely be concealed,) as in the following advertisement which appeared in the *Record*, June 8, 1848.

ADVOWSON WANTED.

THE friends of a clergyman, of standing and experience in the ministry, are anxious to **PURCHASE** for him a desirably-circumstanced **ADVOWSON**, of from 500*l.* to 600*l.* per annum, where there is a prospect of very early possession.

Address, W. N., care of Messrs. Mudie, Stationers, Coventry-street. All replies to this advertisement will be acknowledged.

Here the person for whom it is purchased is honestly referred to ; and they who make no such reference in print, have a mental reference. How far those sharing in such benefits, can read the canonical oath with calmness, is a matter for their own consciences.

Who for instance, will purchase the following, without intending it for a particular friend ?

CHURCH PREFERMENT.

TO be **DISPOSED OF**, the **NEXT** and **IMMEDIATE PRESENTATION** to a **CHURCH** without Cure of Souls, in a seaport town, on the borders of Cheshire. Income between 200*l.* and 300*l.* a year.—(*Midland Counties Herald*, Jan. 9, 1851.)

We need say nothing here of the Church with a *fair income and no cure of souls*, a sad instance of spiritual corruption, which only the utmost passivity in Englishmen can tolerate,—the sale itself if effected, will most probably be a direct violation of the law ;—a purchase for a fore-known individual.

But this legal view of the matter, involving as even it does a moral element, is nothing in comparison to the spiritual wickedness of such a system ; by which religion is prostituted for gold ; its most sacred offices made a matter of trade, purchased—not for the cure of souls,—but to secure the unrighteous mammon !

But the question becomes still more solemn and awful, when we consider **THE OATH** enjoined by the fortieth canon, to be administered to all entering any office in the Church.

This Canon is as follows :

“40. *An oath against Simony at Institution into Benefices.* To avoid the detestable sin of Simony, because buying and selling of spiritual and ecclesiastical functions, offices, promotions, dignities, and livings, IS EXECRABLE BEFORE GOD ; therefore the Archbishop, Bishop, or other person or persons, having authority to admit, institute, collate, in-

* See Knight's Political Dictionary. Article, Benefice.

stall, or to confirm the election of any Archbishop, Bishop, or other person or persons, to any spiritual or ecclesiastical function, dignity, promotion, title, office, jurisdiction, place, or benefice, with or without cure, or to any ecclesiastical living whatsoever, *shall*, before every such admission, institution, collation, installation, or confirmation of election, *respectively minister to every person hereafter to be admitted*, instituted, collated, installed, or confirmed, in or to any Archbishopric, Bishopric, or other spiritual or ecclesiastical function, dignity, promotion, title, office, jurisdiction, place, or benefice without cure, or in or to any ecclesiastical living whatsoever, *this OATH in form and manner following*, the same to be taken by every one whom it concerneth, IN HIS OWN PERSON, and not by a proctor.

I, N. N. do *swear* that I have made no simoniacal payment, contract, or promise, DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, by myself, or by any other, TO MY KNOWLEDGE, or *with my consent*, to any person or persons whatsoever, for or concerning the procuring and obtaining of this ecclesiastical dignity, place, preferment, office, or living,—respectively and particularly naming the same, whereunto he is to be admitted, instituted, collated, installed, or confirmed—nor will at any time hereafter perform or satisfy any such kind of payment, contract, or promise, made by any other without my knowledge or consent: So help me God, through Jesus Christ.”

This is a fearful oath, especially when we remember the extensive trade in livings; it would be strange if some consciences are not ensnared in this ordeal;—is it not true that some pay out of their own pockets, by means of a lawyer or a friend; do not some pay through their parents; and do not those who pay nothing often accept a living which they know has been purchased, and thus violate the spirit of their oath, which is to be interpreted by the introductory clause,—that simony, or the buying and selling of ecclesiastical livings is a detestable sin, execrable before God? *Will it then make any material difference, who buys, if we accept?* Do we not thus live on the fruit of acknowledged execrable and detestable sin? Do not the spirit and express terms of this canon, condemn all sales of presentations, &c.? Are they then held guiltless, who though they may not directly share in the trade, yet knowingly live on the profits? And is not every one believing this canon, bound in conscience to refuse or vacate a purchased living:—would not this silence a large number?

This whole question of selling and swearing, is a melancholy theme; and affords too fair a chance for the sneer of the infidel at all religion; it tends to blunt the arrows of truth from the pulpit, as the careless or hardened remember *the cost of the living*, and look upon the whole as a machinery of state and commerce, not a divine institution demanding obedience to its message of mercy from heaven.

These are the State chains, the political and worldly defilements to which Christianity in England will ever be subject, till it is free from the pollutions and bribery of an alliance with the State.

JOHN WYCLIFFE.

IV.

SCEPTIC'S RELIGION.

Under this department, sceptical objections, and systems or principles advocated as hostile to Christianity, are dispassionately considered.

THE ATHEIST'S BOX; OR THE ARGUMENT FROM DESIGN.

[To the Editor of the Bible and the People.]

DEAR SIR,

From the title of your periodical, and the plain straight-forward way in which your keys unlock the questions on which many of us are mystified; I conclude that your efforts are in a great measure intended for the working classes. And as a humble member of those classes, I presume to offer you a few thoughts, on the "Infidel Press."

Perhaps you may not have seen the parts to which I beg leave to call your attention; and if my simple observations are of any service, it will give me great pleasure.

I hope you will not forget to watch whether the Free-thinking organ gives any fair answer to your remarks on their way of doing things, or rather as we say, their way of *doing people*. For there seems some priestcraft amongst infidels; though some honest persons are led away by a sort of smartness which looks a good deal like wit. But to keep to my point, there is another publication, (the Elder Brother, or at least a very near relation of the Free-thinker,) with which you may not be acquainted; though your name and undertaking are familiar to its readers.

I forward you herewith an Article headed "an Appeal, &c.," on your behalf; which was written about the time you were dissecting the Free-thinker. "Our energetic opponent" says the Editor, "lately issued the following lithographed circular. Through weary weeks we have looked for 'The Bible and the People', and now that December has set in, we are unable longer to remain in silent suspense." He little thought what was coming: they do not like that way of dealing: they say you are "facetious; and the Bible and the People will be a sort of evangelical Punch."

Now sir, we perhaps want a little of this, for why should the sceptic have all the laughter on his own side? Those should laugh that win; and therefore we need not be so melancholy in this business. The scoffer does not like to be answered according to his folly; but prefers a grave divine who will cast pearls to be trampled.

But different methods are required for different purposes. When they

argue, answer them; when they misrepresent, expose them; when they jeer and burlesque, shew them that it is no joke at all; and they will believe though they may not confess.

By the way, can you tell me how far the following is true;—it is a reference to one of your friends, by this near relative of the free-thinker:—“Edward Baines of the *Leeds Mercury*, being put forth as a patron of a publication for the people, *who denies them public knowledge*, is a rich joke.” It is perhaps my obtuseness, but there seems nothing rich, but only a slander,—which as I take it, *is no joke*. Does this gentleman *really* “deny public knowledge” to the people? I have heard of his paper as being a widely extended enlightener of the public, and so am much puzzled in my judgment. If a person who spends his life in honestly writing, is said to deny the people public knowledge, one may well wonder who are the friends of instruction.*

Perhaps this writer enjoys “the fellowship of kindred minds” with the oracle whose responses you examined last month. He however appears very kindly disposed towards you, for he observes, that “as a very few persons, *so far as we can learn* have taken any notice of this solicitation, we will show his circular to our readers.”

But the most extraordinary article, and that to which I wished to request your attention, is the following on the value of *the argument from design, for establishing the existence of God*.

For these free-thinkers are professed atheists; and the periodical herewith sent to you, is to favour the world with public knowledge—the denial of the God that made us.

These sentiments will shock many of your readers: but the defence of them will not terrify any thinking persons.

By a kind of happy temerity, the writer has prefaced his attack on the existence of God, by an extract from the *Edinburgh Review*, which (if you have room to insert it), will shew the folly of the atheism appended to it, as a vain and ridiculous attempt at refutation.

And therefore should my plain and simple remarks, not appear a sufficient answer to this bold dogma or negation, your readers will still have the bane and antidote before them.

The following is the entire article:—

“WHAT IS THE VALUE OF THE DESIGN ARGUMENT.

THE *Edinburgh Review*, for October 1849, contains a very able article entitled ‘Reason and Faith; their Claims and Conflicts,’ from which the following extract, commencing at page 512, is made:

‘Without entering into the many different sources of argument for the existence of a Supreme Intelligence, we shall only refer to that proof on which all theists, savage or civilized, in some form or other rely—the traces of an ‘eternal power and godhead’ in the visible creation. The argument depends on a principle which, whatever may be its metaphysical history or origin, is one which man perpetually recognizes, which

* Our correspondent is quite right; slander is no joke; but some writers can succeed best, either in misrepresenting the cause, or slandering the characters of those they should refute.—[EDITOR.]

every act of his own consciousness verifies, which he applies fearlessly to every phenomenon, known or unknown ; and it is this—That every effect has a cause (though he knows nothing of their connection,) and that effects which bear marks of design have a designing cause. This principle is so familiar that if he were to affect to doubt it in any *practical* case in human life, he would only be laughed at as a fool, or pitied as insane. The evidence, then, which substantiates the greatest and first of truths, mainly depends on a principle perfectly familiar and perfectly recognized. Man can estimate the *nature* of that evidence ; and the *amount* of it, in this instance, he sees to be as vast as the sum of created objects ; nay, far more, for it is as vast as the sum of their relations. So that if (as is apt to be the case) the difficulties of realizing this tremendous truth are in proportion to the extent of knowledge and the powers of reflection, the evidence we can perfectly appreciate is cumulative in an equal or still higher proportion. Obvious as are the marks of design in each individual object, the sum of proof is not merely the sum of such indications, but that sum infinitely multiplied by the relations established and preserved amongst all these objects ; by the adjustment which harmonizes them all into one system, and impresses on all the parts of the universe a palpable order and subordination. While even in a single part of an organized being (as a hand or an eye) the traces of design are not to be mistaken, these are indefinitely multiplied by similar proofs of contrivance in the many individual organs of one such being—as of an entire animal or vegetable. These are yet to be multiplied by the harmonious relations which are established of mutual proportion and subserviency amongst all the organs of any one such being. And as many beings even of that one species or class as there are, so many multiplicies are there of the same proofs. Similar indications yield similar proofs of design in each individual *part*, and in the *whole* individual of *all* the individuals of every other class of beings ; and this sum of proof is again to be multiplied by the proofs of design in the adjustment and mutual dependence and subordination of each of these *classes* of organized beings to every other, and to all ; of the vegetable to the animal—of the lower animal to the higher. Their magnitudes, numbers, physical force, faculties, functions, duration of life, rates of multiplication and development, sources of subsistence, must all have been determined in exact ratios, and could not transgress certain limits without involving the whole universe in confusion. This amazing sum of probabilities is yet to be further augmented by the fact that all these classes of organized substances are intimately related to those great elements of the material world in which they live, to which they are adapted, and which are adapted to them ; that all of them are subject to the influence of certain mighty and subtle agencies which pervade all nature—and which are of such tremendous potency that any *chance* error in their proportions of activity would be sufficient to destroy all, and which yet are exquisitely balanced and inscrutably harmonized.

‘The proofs of design arising from the relations thus maintained between all the parts, from the most minute to the most vast, of our own world, are still to be further multiplied by the inconceivably momentous relations subsisting between our own and other planets and their common centre ; amidst whose sublime and solemn phenomena science has most

clearly discovered that everything is accurately adjusted by geometrical precision of force and movement; where the *chances* of error are infinite, and the proofs of intelligence, therefore, equal. These proofs of design in each fragment of the universe, and in all combined, are continually further multiplied by every fresh discovery, whether in the minute or the vast—by the microscope or the telescope; for every fresh law that is discovered, being in harmony with all that has previously been discovered, not only yields its own proof of design, but infinitely more, by all the relations in which it stands to other laws: it yields, in fact, as many as there are adjustments which have been effected between itself and all besides. Each new proof of design, therefore, is not a solitary fact: but one which, entering as another element into a most complex machinery, indefinitely multiplies the combinations, in any one of which chance might have gone astray. From this infinite array of proofs of design, it seems to man's reason, in ordinary moods, stark madness to account for the phenomena of the universe upon any other supposition than that which does account, and can alone account, for them all—the supposition of a Presiding Intelligence, illimitable alike in power and in wisdom.*

For the purpose of keeping the real nature of the design argument steadily before the reader, (the Atheist observes,) I will convert it into this short proposition—Objects which bear marks of design have an *intelligent* cause. The material universe, therefore, has an Intelligent Cause.

When theists say that "Objects which bear marks of design have an intelligent cause," they, in reality, assert that ALL objects which bear marks of design have an intelligent cause. But how have they ascertained this? Simply by *assuming* it.

Now, as no argument can be sound whose premises are untrue, it must be obvious that, if the premises from which the design argument is evolved are untrue, the design argument can be of no value whatever.

The premises from which the design argument is evolved are the assumption that *all* objects which bear marks of design have an intelligent cause. These premises I shall show to be untrue, by exhibiting numerous objects bearing unequivocal marks of profound design, which have NOT an intelligent cause.

Here is an acorn. I plant it in the ground: whence will issue, in time, a young tree, which, through the influences of air, moisture, &c., will become a magnificent oak, bearing unequivocal marks of profound design.

If I substitute the seeds of the beech tree, the plane tree, &c., for the acorn, analogous objects, bearing marks of profound design, will be obtained.

Here then we have a group of objects, bearing unequivocal marks of profound design, which have *not* an intelligent cause.

Here are a number of eggs. I place them in a box kept at a *regulated* temperature. After the lapse of a certain time chickens will be obtained, which, through the influences of food, air, moisture, &c., will become adult birds, bearing unequivocal marks of profound design.

If I substitute the eggs of eagles, pheasants, grouse, &c., for those of

* The Article from which the above is extracted, is re-published, (with an Appendix,) as a small volume. It is written by the Rev. Henry Rogers, of Spring Hill College, Birmingham. Its highest praise is, that it is worthy of the Author's pen.—[EDITOR.]

the hen, analogous objects, bearing unequivocal marks of profound design, will be obtained.

Here then we have another group, of a different description, of objects bearing unequivocal marks of profound design, which *have not an intelligent cause*.

Here is a living, breathing horse. Every part of him bears marks of profound design—of adaptation of means to ends—of nice adjustment of parts. And has he an intelligent cause? No. [The illustration of this is withheld for decency's sake.]

Lions, tigers, &c., are produced in a manner similar to the horse.

Here then we have a third group of objects dissimilar to either of the preceding ones, bearing unequivocal marks of profound design, and which have *not* an intelligent cause.

Now as no argument can be sound whose premises are untrue, and as the premises from which the design argument is evolved are the assumption that all objects which bear marks of design have an intelligent cause, and as I have shown these premises to be untrue, by exhibiting numerous objects bearing unequivocal marks of profound design which have *not* an intelligent cause—it follows that *the design argument is of no value whatever*.
ALIIQUIS.

P.S.—I beg to invite the author of "Reason and Faith," or any other able Christian advocate, to join me in a written discussion on these important questions—*What is the value of the evidence offered in support of the existence of a Supreme Intelligence? What is the value of the evidence offered in support of the truth of Christianity.* A.

[Nearly three years since we published a paper of Aliquis's, entitled "Have we sufficient proof of the Existence of God?" copies of which we sent to the leading clergy and literary men who support Christianity, requesting (if we were in error,) the favour of their enlightenment. The only replies received were from Mr. Burke, Professor Young, and James Martineau. Aliquis has now sent us the above paper, conceived in a comprehensive, and expressed in a lucid manner, in which he assails one of the strongest fortresses of theology. We shall forward it also to selections of the clergy and others, from whom we trust to hear in reply."—ED.]

Being no great *Reasoner* myself, my authority is nothing, but there does appear as great a disparity between the arguments of the extract from the Review and the answer to it, as there is between the styles of writing. The first is a masterpiece, in which logic and judgment keep pace with the eloquence of language; in the other, there is nothing but assumption, and a vulgar temerity.

Do the advocates of design *start* with an *assumption* that all things indicating marks of intelligence are the result of a designing mind: or is not this an *inference* to which they have fairly attained by *examining what is within the reach of their certain knowledge*?

Thus we know of no books or houses or clothes, that came by accident: and hence men are taught trades that they may be able to act with intelligence and effect. All human experience goes to prove *that those things*

the origin of which we know, had an originator with intelligence proportioned to their production.

This is true of the steam engine, or any invention; as well as authorship or skill in any craft.

We account for such productions by a proportionate skill; in other words from the effect we judge of the cause. Now it is a natural and legitimate process, to apply this rule to other similar cases; and since for all productions of which we can actually trace the origin, we find a proportionate intelligent cause, the same is to be inferred respecting the works of nature.

Whereas this writer reverses the process, and assumes that all unknown instances are unlike what is known; *so that if this principle be true, HUMAN EXPERIENCE IS WORTHLESS.* Yet in every-day life, we have no other guide than to reason from experience. Even in single instances, where the author cannot be discovered, his existence is not doubted:—a detective officer, finds *marks of design* on a door post, on forced desks and cupboards; and without seeing any suspected person, infallibly concludes that a burglar has been at work, with certain implements and intentions. And no atheist would deny the inference: but the kind of evidence which will prove the existence of a robber, is (it seems) mere assumption, when used to prove the existence of a Creator. Thus will men depart from the maxims and usages of common sense, to construct the Sceptics' religion; whilst they ridicule our senseless superstitions. Aliquis does not say who told him that trees "have not an intelligent cause," though "bearing unequivocal marks of design."

Surely these *must be very equivocal* marks, which indicate what, according to this Reasoner, is not true.

There is however some credit reserved to himself, though the Creator may have none. Since he observes, "*if I substitute* (for the acorn) the seeds of the beech, the plane, &c. analogous objects will be obtained." This Author therefore will claim a share in design as he decides what kind of seeds he will employ; and a beech or oak avenue, shall accordingly indicate an intelligent agent who chose and employed the seeds, whilst He "*who giveth to every seed its own body,*" has no honour from the beautiful result. There is plainly a designer called a gardener, who lays out the flower beds, and chooses the seeds; but none in making the seeds; and adapting the seasons and elements for their growth.

This gentleman says the same about horses; the grooming and shoeing of these animals, are evidences of a designer; but adapting their frame to their useful purposes, is a matter of chance. The grooming is done by somebody; the horse is invented by NOBODY.

Formerly, Mr. Editor, this gentleman—Squire Nobody—used to do everything mischievous, now it appears he does everything beneficial. In my younger days, a broken window or other fatality was ascribed to Nobody; he was reckoned the most active agent for evil: he took the place of all witches and suspicious visitants. But now the doctrine is changed, by those *who do not* "deny knowledge to the public,"—who teach that Nobody does all the good we experience.

Then Sir, it will follow that Aliquis though he claimed the only intelligent part in making oaks, (*viz.* choosing and sowing the acorns) has

really nothing to do with it; for *Aliquis*, I am told, means *Somebody*, whereas Nobody does everything of consequence. Nobody frames and upholds the laws of Nature; Nobody fashions every herb after the germ of its seed; he frames the different species of animals, and preserves those species in the world, distinct from each other. He created and continues mankind, in all pre-eminence of endowments: Nobody causeth the grass to grow for cattle, and clotheth the hills with corn: Nobody sends rain and sunshine and the alternation of the seasons. If this be true, Sir, I am so far an Atheist, that I should advocate the *worship of Nobody*.

But I shall weary your readers, and therefore hasten in conclusion to examine the *Atheist's Box*: he observes,—“here are a number of eggs, I place them in a box kept at a regulated temperature. After a lapse of time chickens will be obtained, &c. *If I substitute* the eggs of eagles, &c., analogous objects will be obtained. Here then we have a group of objects bearing unequivocal marks of design, which have *not* an intelligent cause.”

This chicken-experiment does appear to me, Mr. Editor, to carry more marks of intelligence than the argument which it is intended to illustrate.

Some will judge that Aliquis is himself in this box; and may turn out only a chicken after all, though he tries to crow at all parsons, as if he were a full-grown bantam.

Was there not a designer to make the box; to warm it, to regulate the heat, to put the egg in, to watch over the hatching, to cackle over the final development? Suppose then this genius had *put a stone as a substitute for the egg*, where would the chicken be? Where Aliquis's argument is, i.e. nowhere. Therefore he still would require Nobody to invent an egg for him; or there would be no means of getting a chicken out of the box, with all Aliquis's designing; at least, no other means besides getting into the box himself; where I leave him and hope, Mr. Editor, you will regulate the temperature.

I am, dear Sir,

Your's faithfully,

JOHN KNOX.

[We shall be happy to hear from our correspondent John Knox, again.
EDITOR.]

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN NATURE.

The Nature of Man as Spiritual, Immortal, and Responsible, will be the most frequent topic of this department: though sometimes we shall introduce MISCELLANEOUS Subjects.

MIND AND MATTER: THEIR EVIDENCES AND DISTINCTIONS.

No apology can be requisite, in introducing such a subject as "Matter and Mind," for all must feel some interest in their own nature, and in the universe wherein they are placed.

Metaphysics, is a word as terrible to some persons as Blue-beard to children, or mathematics to professed novel readers.

Hence the majority of persons, frightened by this name, have become alienated from those studies which are classed under it; and have withdrawn themselves altogether from enquiries into the nature of mind, and the fundamental principles of human knowledge, into the region of physics or matter, where they find something tangible; and which they suppose easily understood: forgetting that NOTHING IS UNDERSTOOD WITHOUT AN UNDERSTANDING, and that therefore if they leave mind they can do little with matter. Nay that all sciences and laws, respecting outward things, are but the classifications and inferences of the mind itself: in other words, much that is named Science, belongs to the Province of Philosophy.

The origin of the name Metaphysics, is an indication that these studies of mind and matter should be united:—"the Greeks divided philosophy into three branches, To Phusicon, To Ethicon, To Dialecticon."—Physics, Ethics, or Morals, and Dialectics or Logic and Intellectual Philosophy in general: and it is said that, the title metaphysics, arose from the direction written upon some tracts; the title being *Meta* (ta) Phusica, *after* the Physics;—simply directing the order of the arrangement, according to the classification of Physics, or the natural Sciences, Morals, and Intellectual Philosophy. So that the name was merely an indication that this line of enquiry should follow the study of natural philosophy: whether this is the best arrangement, may be questioned, since the intellectual enquiries are of the greater consequence; and properly conducted, prepare for the only successful investigation of nature. Though from the simplicity of natural enquiries, the familiarity we may early obtain with the objects of the senses; this enquiry, together with the acquisition of languages, history, arithmetic, and other school occupations, may properly engage

the faculties, and provide materials, until the mind is sufficiently matured to deal with those higher principles of evidence, on which alone a true science of history, and every other department of human knowledge can be based.

It is not our province here however, to establish a philosophy of education; but to caution persons against the shallow pretence, that we have certainty and knowledge only in material things, while in fact our only certainty depends upon proper mental cultivation.

The life is more than meat, and the body is more than raiment; and the soul is more than the body.

But since amongst the other fallacies of sense, our world not only seems to have the sun and the whole visible heavens revolving round it, whilst it is only changing its own place:—since in addition to this fallacy by which this life and outward nature seem more real, than another life and the inward spirit, it may not be out of place to remove this impression if possible, by the aid of that philosophy which arises from and recognizes man's spiritual nature.

At any rate, the attempt however imperfect, will not displease those who would introduce man to a happiness suited to his dignity as “the offspring of God.” And however the fine gold may become dim, the likeliest motive to recover its lustre, is the conviction of its value; which may both shew that it was intended to bear the image of God, and help to prepare it for its true impression and stamp of divinity—the “image and superscription” of the King of Kings.

It is confessed that this subject, being remote from the usual current of men's thoughts, will be difficult from its strangeness: but this should be no objection, since it occurs in the commencement of every study: and in general, what is easy may be held cheap, since every thing of value has its proportionate price.

It is on these accounts that in treating of such a subject, we need the fullest amount of candour and attention, in those we address, since it is not so easy to blend amusement with this enquiry as it may be in some others; nor is it so necessary, as those who are supposed likely to attend to such question, would rather be taught than amused: which latter is the proper play for those who have no serious work; and is suitable to such teachers as put smartness for solidity, and such enquirers as would rather laugh than learn.

In enquiring into mind and matter,—the evidence, existence, and qualities of both, there are four points, which for the sake of distinctness though perhaps not at equal lengths, will demand our notice!

- I. The general metaphysical way of arguing upon this subject.
- II. The system of Idealism, as exhibited in Berkeley's view of material existences.
- III. The usual way of judging respecting the qualities of material objects, and distinguishing one from another:—which is the province of the Sciences.
- IV. To shew that mind is distinguished from matter, in the same way as one material object is distinguished from another material object only more clearly and fundamentally:—which is one province of Philosophy.

I. The general metaphysical way of arguing upon this subject of mind and matter:—in which one sect asserts that matter is capable by arrangements and organization, of exhibiting mental properties; whilst the other sect affirms that this is impossible; and requires another kind of thing, to produce another kind of results.

Dr. Priestley maintained that “man does not consist of two substances essentially different from each other; but that the conscious principle, or what we generally term the soul, is merely a property resulting from such an organical structure as that of the brain.” The relation of such a doctrine, to the religious questions of an intermediate state, the resurrection and a future life in general, we have nothing to do with here, since that is a department of theology; and we are considering the present question solely by the light of reason and philosophy; since it is from this light that some would examine theology itself: so that whatever *arguments* we adduce here, should be based on neutral grounds,—on the reason of the thing, as a strictly natural enquiry.

As a sufficient examination of Dr. Priestley's views, we shall adduce some observations from Mr. Belsham, who besides having a just reverence for the Doctor's scientific attainments, had also a general agreement with him, as to religious opinions. Mr. Belsham has written one Essay on this subject, in which he professes to state the arguments upon both sides.* The most considerable in favour of an immaterial principle of thought, and the one generally adopted by those who believe in this principle, is the following:—“that the principle of perception or consciousness, being in its own nature, a simple unextended power, must exist in a simple, unextended and indivisible substance; whereas the properties of extension and solidity are essential to matter, which therefore consists of separable, nay actually separate and distinct parts; and as the whole can contain no more than the sum or amount (and result) of the qualities in each of the parts; no system or organization of such parts of matter, can have perception; unless each part had perception: and since matter is infinitely divisible, (then each part would contain an infinite number of perceptions,) its own consciousness would be infinitely divisible; which is an absurdity. Or if matter consist of ultimate particles, (or atoms, which cannot be actually further divided,) and each possess a degree of perception, such an organization as the brain, must consist of a multitude of distinct and separate perceptions, (“formed into one by which every man is a thousand individuals, and so is not an *individual* at all, but is divided into a man of parts.”)

But it is replied by materialists, that a unity of consciousness, or a feeling that we are ONE, is the result of a peculiar system, by which parts that have no perception in themselves, have perception when arranged together: just as roundness “is a property belonging to a complete globe, of which the component parts are destitute:—a harpsichord possesses powers from the arrangement of the parts, specifically different from those which belong to the parts themselves.”

On this argument it is observed, that these arrangements, “are only so many different arrangements of figure, motion, &c., qualities of which each component part of these machines is possessed: and the power of

* “Essays Philosophical, Historical, and Literary.” Published Anonymously, in two vols.

the whole is (nothing new, but) the result of the united powers of all the parts." "Figure, magnitude, and motion, are qualities inherent in matter, but these eternally varied, can produce only different combinations of figure magnitude and motion:" the roundness of the globe, may be called new, but is only a new position of each particle; and it is no really new quality that it stands in another place: whilst the whole figure is composed of the separate parts, arranged into another general form. Divide the globe, and you have two hemispheres; divide consciousness, and have you two half-consciousnesses?

Again of the harpsichord, this is only a new figure, producing a different succession of vibrations in the air, to which every particle contributes; whilst the music is in the mind—"a sensation of harmonic sounds."

But from all the skilful arrangements of matter, no thought is produced in the matter arranged, but new figures and motions: "to affirm that perception can arise from a combination of impercipient principles, is as ridiculous as to affirm that a combination of the seven primary colours, with the four cardinal virtues, may form a planet; or, that an epic poem is composed of parallelograms, cones, and triangles:—an absurdity not less real, than that of the blind man, who thought that the idea of scarlet, resembled the sound of a trumpet."*

There is however one argument, apparently powerful, for a new set of properties, by a new mixture of substances, for instance in *chemical affinity*; where two substances may by coming into union, lose a poisonous property, and become useful to health: or *vice versa*. As the metal arsenic is not at all poisonous in itself, but becomes poisonous when formed into arsenious acid by being mixed with the oxygen of the atmosphere:—that oxygen which is essential to life. Again in other changes, as brimstone and quicksilver, losing their properties by being united; and becoming formed into vermilion.

This is the nearest approach to making mind out of matter; though some people suspect that *these chemical results are only chemical and not intelligent*: and that whilst chemical properties may modify each other, still the consequence is only the result of the combined separate powers, by definite chemical action, producing a chemical effect: it would be a comical effect, if any mixture of ingredients should produce a philosopher: it would be a worthy experiment to this; it is beyond Dr. Priestley himself, who was no mean hand at natural experiments: whoever shall be successful in this line; may enquire of the new made philosopher, after the remaining secrets of nature. And indeed, we do not see the impossibility of the discovery, every anatomist, physiologist, and chemist, knows what brains are, or ought to do, if he have any: cannot he not therefore combine the same *materials*; and by the help of a complete skeleton, which he will clothe as *per prescriptionem*, fill up the skull, "pigeon egg of discretion," with the wondrous combination, and pouring in a little mixture of animal spirits, with the ethereal tincture of nervous energy,—set the whole machine a-going, so as to be even better than Martinus Scriblerus's "wood and leather man," who could "reason as well as most country parsons?"

When the feat of combination and chemical affinity is performed, we

recommend the fortunate fabricator, to send the prodigy to the museum of the author of "the Vestiges of Creation."

We cannot say unto this specimen of humanity, "poor soul," nor "alas, poor ghost," for there is not even the ghost of a soul: "they deck it with silver and with gold; they fasten it with nails and with hammers, that it move not." And yet there is no need for this precaution, for though these creations are "upright as the palm tree, they speak not; *they must needs be borne, because they CANNOT GO*—they cannot do evil, neither also is it in them to do good"—(Jer. x. 4, 5.)

"Their idols are silver and gold, the work of men's hands; they have mouths but they speak not: eyes have they, but they see not:—feet have they, but they walk not;—they that make them are like unto them, so is every one that trusteth in them."—(Ps. cxv. 4—8.)

Men may make a calf, but they cannot even teach it to "low,"—the only lesson these inferior creators are "apt to teach."

REVIEWS AND CRITICISMS.

"*The Fear of Death; or, why should an Atheist fear to die.*" By S. WILLIAMS.

"*The Creed of Error; in reply to Holyoake's 'Logic of Death.'*" Partridge and Oakley, Paternoster-row. These two Tracts are by the same hand; and do great credit to the Author; who is we believe a London City Missionary: we want such men in such a position; with an army of these, we need fear neither the Priesthood of superstition nor of Infidelity. We recommend these tracts for circulation.

"*The Logic of Life; in reply to Holyoake's 'Logic of Death.'*" William Horsell, Aldine Chambers, Paternoster-row. A most desirable production, by a working man;—J. HARRISON, of Newcastle. It is a small tract.

"*Political Monopoly hostile to the Spirit of Christianity.*" By a Norwich Operative. Jarrold and Sons, St. Paul's Church-yard. This is the true line; working men, finding their liberty in the Bible.

"*Protestant Priestism: a Lecture.*" By Henry MORE. Jarrold, St. Paul's Church-yard. A very valuable and instructive threepenny Pamphlet.

I.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD." 1 Thess. v. 21.

REASON, NOT RATIONALISM; OR TRUE METHODS OF EXAMINING THE BIBLE.

We are furnished in the early history of Christianity, with an example of candid and independent enquiry; and this is not only commended, but left on record for our imitation. Respecting the Bereans we are told "These were *more noble* than those of Thessalonica, in that they received the word in all readiness of mind, and *searched the Scriptures daily*, whether those things were so."—(Acts xvii. 11.)

Paul and Silus, having been persecuted in one city, fled into another; not merely to avoid persecution, though this is proper, when our witnessing for the truth is of no advantage to the truth, but only an injury to us; and when we can do more good, in another sphere: and hence these men fled, not from cowardice, but that the work which they could not do in one place, might be done in another. And here we are instructed, not only by what the Apostles directly taught, but by the example of those to whom they addressed themselves. From those of Thessalonica, we are warned against prejudice, apathy or fanaticism in rejecting the truth: whilst in the Bereans, we have an example of candour and reasonable enquiry.

The term "noble," in our language, like that which corresponds to it in the Greek, (of the N. T.) stands originally for high birth; but also has a common secondary meaning, of honourable or worthy: just as we speak of a *nobleman*, which is not necessarily the same as a noble *man*. It was the character and not the rank, which called forth the commendation in our text.

Dr. Bloomfield, in his Notes on the N. T. leans to the idea of station, as primarily referred to: it does not he says, mean strictly "noble, (for the men were probably tradesmen) but rather the *better sort of people*, the more respectable:" which he adds, "may include the sense of candid, and well disposed; since it is observable, that the better or more respectable class of persons, are usually more disposed to a calm and rational investigation of truth, than those of the inferior and less reflecting multitude."* Whether these distinctions between classes of men,—true nobleness being commensurate with rank,—whether this be true or false, it is at least invidious, and not like a gospel speculation.

* Rev. S. T. Blomfield, on N. T. Acts xvii. 11. Greek text with English Notes.

Indeed there are many reasons from the nature of the thing, for supposing that candour is not natural or probable, as a general rule, among the high-born and respectable. For though these have the advantage of education, yet their very respectability pledges them to many opinions, which form a part of the fashionable belief: *to depart from which would not be respectable*: this is true of politics, of religion, and of all those subjects which are mixed up intimately with parties, and the schemes of social life. And however the present age, may be free from the *prejudices incidental to respectability and station*; it is certain that the age of Christ and his Apostles was as much enslaved to the old *customs of belief*; as we are to the manners and fashions of society.

Hence, "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, nor **MANY NOBLE**," were employed as gospel agents; but "the base things of the world;" whilst Scribes and Pharisees,—the educated and respectable, together with the "princes of this world," understood not the wisdom which was revealed unto babes. It would therefore ill become Paul, the tent maker, as the associate of the fishermen of Galilee, to draw such distinctions between the classes of society; nor is it suited to the dignity of that gospel which looks not at men's circumstances, but their eternal destiny:—a gospel about one who though Lord of all, was born in humble life, was himself one of the "lower orders;" and whose gospel was pre-eminently to the poor; pre-eminently received by the "common people;" whilst the respectable, or better sort of men, were too noble to receive him on whom none of the rulers believed. This is *not* therefore a reference to the rank in life, of these Bereans; they did not examine the Scriptures, *because* they were more noble; but *were more noble because* they examined the Scriptures. Herein then, lay the nobility here spoken of, not in high birth, but in candour, *or openness of mind, eagerness for instruction, and diligence in examining its truth.*

And this is recorded for our example: in considering this example, the greatest difficulty arises from the width of the subject: since it embraces—men's indisposition for serious and independent enquiry; the obstacles formed by undue authority; the false methods in which men often examine the Bible; the wrong motives which influence them; the true method; the right motives; and the imperative duty of every person thus to search the Scriptures, to see whether these things are so.

By "the Scriptures" here, the Old Testament is intended; as probably that alone, was written at the time; and was referred to in support of Christ as the promised Messiah: but the principle applies to the New Testament as well: which together with the Old, we here recognize as the word of God,—for reasons already advanced; namely, that when examined, they carry their own evidence; as a gem speaks for itself, in the eyes of a real judge.

Since therefore this book, is the wisdom of God; we must examine it, as we examine his works; that whilst *there* we seek to discover and understand what he *does*; we may *here* learn what he *says*.

We shall on a future occasion show the impropriety of looking for religious truth in the developments of it in the religious life or creeds of the professedly religious world; instead of in the unvarying written word, which is the true test of faith and conduct: and we have now to point

out the wrong and right ways of examining this written word: giving in brief, a kind of popular hermeneutics, or theology for the people. And the principles we shall attempt in this enquiry, to refute or to recommend, will be abundantly exemplified in subsequent enquiries into fundamental doctrines.

We may notice—

- I. The natural opposition to any enquiry; arising from love of a system received, and supported by misrepresentations of other systems.
- II. The obstacles to free enquiry, in civil and ecclesiastical authority.
- III. The misuse of free enquiry.
- IV. The proper use of it, and motives thereto.

I. NATURAL INDISPOSITION TO FREE ENQUIRY, arising from love of systems received, and fostered by misrepresentation of opposing systems.

Men are disposed to remain satisfied with opinions as they are: to let others judge for them; to go with the herd, and take up a *set of doctrines* ready made; and to wear it as a mental coat done to the prevailing fashion. The majority do not form their opinions, but receive them formed; nor do they enquire into the reasons, but are satisfied with following.

And further, *opinions go in sets*; if we take one, we must take the lot; all go together; and one opinion from this party, another from that, are too often regarded as two odd books; of little use and no ornament, till the number is complete. Thus do men generally regard doctrines or opinions, as if each formed a link in a single chain; or as if the whole constituted a series of propositions in a rigid demonstration. Hence few persons think of giving up one of their opinions, for fear of losing all. Indeed this has perhaps made many young men infidels,—finding some one point apparently overthrown, and thereupon abandoning the whole Bible,—because some interpretation, or non-essential point, is made to appear absurd. For the same reason, men will seldom adopt *any* sentiment, usually held by the party to which they are generally opposed: lest this should seem like a concession in favour of *all* the sentiments of the opposite party. Though perhaps the opinion in question, may as well be held by one side, as by the other. And thus different sections, become walled up; and do not receive that *mutual help from mutual enquiries, which would modify every system*; leading men to cross the hereditary borders, and intersecting each others' territory, to form the whole into one united kingdom.

In order to support these ancient landmarks of party, men misrepresent—from ignorance or wilfulness—the doctrines to which they are opposed. For we form an attachment to our opinions, treating them as personal friends; whilst the contrary sentiments, are looked upon with hostile feelings; they are counted our enemies: and the same feeling which prompts us to flatter our friends, leads us to calumniate our antagonists; hence it seems as difficult, to state fairly the opinions of those who differ, as to do justice to a personal enemy. Accordingly, in most controversial works, we find the opposite doctrines caricatured rather than stated. Thus between Calvinists and Armenians,—the Armenian, represents Calvinism as a system which makes God a tyrant, and man a machine; which is true only of hyper-calvinism, or religious

fatalism in its grossest form : but is false of that temperate and philosophical calvinism, advocated by many enlightened men. On the other hand, Armenianism is misrepresented as a system of will-worship ; a doctrine of human works, to the utter denial of divine grace ; which no Armenian ever believed or will acknowledge.

So also of Unitarians and Trinitarians ; in trinitarian arguments, we often find the motives of the opponents distorted and condemned ; and their opinions described as little better than infidel ; whilst the instances are drawn from extreme cases. And on the other side, Unitarian writers are usually prepared with a string of absurdities, which no one believes : thus they insist on the vindictiveness of the divine character in punishing an innocent Saviour ; instead of the *love of a Father*, in allowing a Son *willingly* to die. Or again, we are taunted with the absurdity of believing that three are one, and one is three ; as if any one believed or pretended to believe, what is thereby meant : for no one says, *that three are one of the same sort, or in the same sense* ; but these three, *make one something else* : as three sides make one triangle : or three primary rays, one perfect light. Now though these illustrations may not be exact, yet they shew, that what is *many* in one sense, may be *one* in another respect, and therefore is never absurd, till misrepresented. The mistake therefore which is made in looking at other systems, consists in this,—PUTTING THE DEDUCTIONS WE DRAW, OR THE DIFFICULTIES WE FEEL, FOR THE SYSTEMS THEMSELVES. In other words, stating our objections, as if they were the doctrines we object to. These Bereans were “more noble,” because they pursued the opposite course,—not enquiring shall we leave Moses, forsake the synagogue, and *follow a crucified malefactor* ?—but looking into Moses, to see whether these things, which Paul declared, were really so,—as he said.

The first thing to be observed then is, that there is in men a natural indisposition for independent enquiry,—because of an indolent and partial love for our own system, and a disposition to misrepresent, rather than examine, contrary doctrines.

II. We have to notice the obstructions to free enquiry, or the use of private judgment, from civil and spiritual authority,—from magistrates and priests. If the civil authority, in the form of kings, queens, and parliaments, emperors or senates,—if this authority extends to religion, then it ought to be rigidly enforced : for as no government allows a violation of its laws in other matters, so neither should it allow any violation in religion : but enforce the government faith and worship with the proper government sanctions,—fine, banishment, prison or death. And this, consistently carried out, would directly nullify the example of these Bereans, for it would make us criminal in imitating their nobleness : and shew that this enquiry belongs not to the people, but to the civil government. This however, is plainly opposed to Christianity ; AND THEREFORE, IF IT WOULD BE WRONG TO ENFORCE SUCH LAWS, IT IS WRONG TO MAKE THEM. But the next obstacle to this free enquiry is,—spiritual authority : backed by the State, as in England ; or standing comparatively alone, as in Roman Catholicism in England :—though this is not above employing the civil arm when it can be obtained.

The Church of Rome does not admit the sufficiency of the Scriptures,

nor the right of private judgment: for, as some argue, Christianity existed, before the New Testament Scriptures were written; and these Scriptures being *occasional* productions, must be explained and completed by that oral tradition which has been in the Church from the beginning. Though *what that tradition is, no one can tell*. And again, to prevent private mistakes, we are said to require an infallible public guide, which is the Church, represented by Councils, or by the Pope. But it is easy to shew that however useful an infallible guide may be, *this* guide is far from infallible; being not only opposed to God's word in many things; but containing in itself contradictory opinions, Pope against Pope, and Council against Council. Nor is it because of the inability of the people to judge for themselves, that Priests advocate a faith in *themselves*; but because the people with a pure Bible, would *be too good judges*.

Besides, it is not pretended by any, that the Bible is enough without oral teaching, not because of the Bible's insufficiency, so much as from men's unwillingness to examine, till urged; as in this case of Paul's preaching. But the true method, is to give the book, that men may look at it, along with any professed explanations. *The same necessity is implied in every art or science, that the initiated shall instruct others*: but this does not prove the insufficiency of science, for science finds teachers: so will the Bible, impel teachers, filling them with what they seek to recommend. As it is written in Daniel, (xi. 33.) "AND THEY THAT UNDERSTAND AMONG THE PEOPLE, SHALL INSTRUCT MANY:" or as it is exemplified in Nehemiah (viii. 8.) "So they read in the book in the Law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." Indeed were it true, that some infallible Church exists; we should have to decide which that Church is; and to decide this we must look into the Bible, being bound to reject whatever is inconsistent with the Scriptures, having found that these things are *not* so.

As Bishop Burnet says,—“He who being convinced of the errors and corruptions of a Church, departs from them, and goes on in the purity of the Christian religion, does pursue the true effect both of his baptism and ordination vows. *For these are to be considered as ties upon him only to God and Christ*; and not to adhere to the other dictates of that body in which he had his birth, baptism and ordination.” The same author tells also, that “it will be a very rash, unmanly and base thing in us, to muffle up our own understandings, and deliver our reason and faith over to others blindfold.” And that “as we owe our hopes of salvation, only to Christ, and to what he has done for us, so it can belong only to him who secured it to us, to fix the terms on which we may look for it: nor can any power on earth, clog the offers that he makes to us in the gospel, with new or other terms, than those we find there made to us.”* And thus much for the obstruction to this free enquiry by the Church of Rome: the same will apply to any other Church which usurps authority; —the claims of the Church of England, and the more consistent Puseyite part of it. For this Oxford school from blindness or deceit, falls down prostrate, and muffles its reason before the undigested folly of the semi-heathen fathers; *enlarges its throat, to swallow the camels of antiquity*; and by the venturesomeness of its own faith, seeks to encourage the

* Burnet on the xxxix. Articles, p. 173, 174, 187.

people in the same superstition ; that having first blinded the people themselves, they may now safely introduce to two blinder guides,—the magistrate and the priest, as God's vice-gerents. This is the opposite method to the one commended in our text, where we find a reasonable examination, instead of that servile ignorance, falsely denominated faith ; in which men thrive on the Church's word,—like an infant unreasoningly nourished by the milk of a holy mother. The method by which all these things are demonstrated is, to shew their absurdity ;* and enquire whether the system must not come from God, since if men had made it, they would have been more reasonable. Absurdity then, is what in their hands appeals to faith, which opposes sense, in more senses than one ; a faith which enables men to mortify their reason, as a part of pride and carnality ; and to become demented, in order to prepare for a reasonable service.

To all this, the nobleness of the Bereans is opposed ; and the Apostles praise those who employ their faculties, whilst their successors wisely prefer that men should bandage their eyes, in order not to perceive the blindness of their guides.

And now can anything be more contrary to the gospel, than that any Church, or body of Priests, from a pretence to infallibility, should seek to put out men's eyes, and becloud men's faculties, when an inspired Apostle, wanted not a passive reception of his word, but praised those who examined :—when our Lord himself, “the greater light,” did not demand unreasoning acquiescence, but enquired, why do ye not of yourselves, judge what is right ?

Having then observed first, the natural indisposition of men to enquire, and secondly, vindicated the right and duty of this free enquiry against *the obstacles from civil and spiritual power* ; we notice in the third place,

III. The misuse of this private judgment, or free enquiry :—the wrong methods adopted by some professing Christians.

And in this, we refer to two classes, the Rationalists properly so called, and those Unitarians, who to a great extent adopt the rationalistic method. By rationalists, we mean those, who find nothing miraculous or supernatural in the Bible,—but explain away into natural and ordinary agencies, whatever this book may contain, as extraordinary and wonderful. Some of these however, will acknowledge that strictly the Bible does *mean* to assert miracles, as well as certain doctrines called orthodox ; but will deny the *truth* of these. The other class on the contrary, instead of making this deduction, after getting at the meaning of the Bible, will make the deductions from the meaning itself : saying that cannot be *intended*, which does not accord with a given standard of reason.

And by the Rationalistic method, we mean a method of making the Bible rational, instead of a reasonable way of coming to its positive meaning. It is indeed sometimes given as a peculiar distinction of Unitarianism, that it admits of the “free and unbiassed use of the understanding on religious subjects.” This freedom however is too precious a boon, to be conceded solely to one body of Christians, nor is it the most graceful display of liberality, to assume that they alone possess it.

* See Sewell's Christian Morals.

It is impossible to carry on an enquiry with this school by means of separate texts merely ; since we must first decide, on what principle the Bible is to be interpreted ; how far it is inspired, and what deference is to be paid to its unequivocal statements.

To such then, we would respectfully suggest, whether the Bible should not be explained like any other book ;—by what it grammatically means ; using all historical helps to explain the peculiar nature of any allusions ? Secondly, whether we are to make larger deductions from its verbal statements, than from those of any other book, written under similar circumstances ? Thirdly, whether everything extraordinary is to be put down as a figure of speech ? Fourthly, whether every figure is to be regarded as an exaggeration ? And fifthly, whether because there is a figure in one place, there is a figure in every place,—**MAKING THE BIBLE ONE LARGE FIGURE OF SPEECH ?**

To exemplify the force of this last enquiry,—whether if there be a figure in one place, there is therefore a figure in another : take for instance—possession by demons, which is often taken for granted to be not real, but a figure, accommodated to the ideas of those times ; why this conclusion is come to, we do not know, except that such possessions do not occur now : nor is it necessary that we should here dispute this interpretation ; granting then for the sake of argument, that such possessions were figures, observe the use made of such an instance,—the Devil, is often spoken of ; but that is a figure because “possession” is so : on the same ground, the Holy Spirit, stands for an influence or effect, —a figurative way of expressing the divine power : and if it be replied, that every quality of person is attributed to these ; we are told, that so also wisdom and charity are personified : which is no doubt true : but because there are some personifications, are there therefore no real persons ? and would not this method make God and Christ, and the Apostles, all figures of speech ?

Or again, our Lord speaks of the water that he gives ; the bread which he is ; the leaven of the Pharisees : are we then to take these instances, and by them to explain every mention of bread, or water, or leaven ? The question here, is not whether it is reasonable to believe in a Devil ; but whether the Bible recognizes such a being : though it would be hard to prove the doctrine unreasonable : we are asked for instance whether it is likely that a supreme being would allow such a rival to thwart his purposes ? And it is certain nothing of the kind would be allowed ; Satan does not circumvent God, but in blind malice, carries out the Creator's designs, as in tempting Judas to betray his Lord. Nor is Satan the only one that opposes God ; for all wicked men do the same ; and therefore sin itself comes to this mere figure, for “who hath resisted his will ?”

In this respect then, such persons misuse the right of free enquiry : by first regarding a doctrine as unreasonable, and next shewing that it *may* be only a way of speaking,—not a literal fact.

Now we are not to search the Bible for reasonable things, which is carrying a theory along with us : but to enquire what the words were intended to signify : and if they convey a false doctrine, we should rather reject the Bible, than make it pliant, to mean simply what squares with our measurement.

As a further exhibition of the misuse, or false method of free enquiry, we may notice, "proposed method of studying the Scriptures; in a discourse before the Members of the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Book and Tract Society: (in the Unitarian Chapel, Mosely Street, Manchester, Dec. 30, 1812. By the Rev. Joseph Bealey.)" The main rule there proposed, is first to draw from the Scriptures a few leading conclusions, from general and unequivocal statements; "as a kind of standard, to which any passages which may appear to have a contrary tendency, *should be reduced*; so far as to be interpreted in consistency with them." This rule is mistaken, since it supposes, that in the Bible, as well as out of it, there may not be truths which seem opposite, but yet which agree; and the proper rule for apparently contradictory passages is, *to take each in such a sense as not to exclude the other*. Nor have we any more right to take one in its absolute sense, and so reduce the other to consistency, than to reverse the process: and make the second first, which would materially influence the conclusion: as we shall see from the instances given. Now that cannot be a true rule of interpretation, which depends for its results, upon which set of passages we choose to consider first.

The first instance given by this author is, (1) "that there is but one God." "If then," he adds, "any texts *seem* either to ascribe the appropriate name of God, or divine attributes and perfections, to any other than the supreme Jehovah; they ought in all reason to be understood in a sense consistent with the fundamental principle already established." It is almost needless to remark here, that the unity of God, is fully recognised by all classes of Christians; and therefore this can settle nothing: but observe the changeableness of this rule: suppose we start on the other enquiry first,—is the name, and are the attributes of God ascribed to any one besides the Father? Then having settled that they are; we may explain all statements of unity, in accordance with this established fact. The (2) second instance given for this rule is, "God is infinitely good;" hence we are told, "if then any expressions are interpreted by some, in such a manner as to draw a cloud over this amiable view of God's character, representing him as vindictive and inexorable; not passing by a single transgression without satisfaction to injured justice, or as having inflicted the full penalty on an *innocent* person, before remitting punishment;" these are to be regarded as untrue representations. But first, the innocency of the substitute is no objection; but essential; nor is this to be regarded a cruelty to the innocent sufferer; but a willing *sacrifice of himself*: and therefore should be left out of the argument. Now it is but reasonable to enquire, why we should come to the conclusion, that God is infinitely good, before examining these statements which are here supposed to make against that conclusion? *These statements ought to enter into, and modify that conclusion, rather than be rectified by it*. Nor is it true, that God's punishments are described as vindictive. Nor can we measure the declarations of a magistrate, by the feelings of a father; what God declares in the capacity of a judge, by what he says in the character of a parent; *the general statements of a regard for the subjects, is no key by which to interpret any declarations about criminals*.

For though the Creator's tender mercies are over all his works, this does not blot out the statement, that he is "angry with the wicked, every day."

Severity towards the guilty, especially when that guilt includes the rejection of an offered mercy, is not inconsistent with the highest goodness; for the law in punishing a few, is merciful to others: nay this amongst men at least, justifies such laws: but the goodness implied in this, is no consolation to a prisoner; and will not translate his sentence into a reward.

If therefore, by "infinite goodness," be meant that God will allow of no suffering, it is false in fact; for many do suffer: and if this infinite goodness, admits of evil, the principle is abandoned, and becomes merely a question of degree. We are not then to gather one truth, and by this interpret another;—not from God's promises to interpret his threatenings; but to regard each, as alike facts, and to be admitted, before drawing our conclusion respecting infinite goodness. (3.) The third instance under this rule is, "the ever blessed God, is entitled to our supreme love;" consequently the interpretation which "represents any other person as the highest object of our gratitude, and in effect, transfers our strongest sense of obligation from the Father to him;—we may safely conclude such interpretation is not true." And *such has never been given:* for whilst grateful to Christ as our Redeemer, we love God, for the gift of his Son: there is no confusion of affection: it is quite possible to love a Son for endangering himself, and a Father for allowing him to do so. Nay more, we might on the rule in question, prove that the Father has no claim on our supreme love, by taking first those passages, which shew that we are to serve the Lord Christ:—that we are to labour, that whether present or absent, we may be accepted of *him*. It is then a false method, to take first one class of passages, give these their absolute meaning, and then modify others by the result; for we can thus begin with which we please, and make any parts the standard of the rest; whereas both sides should be fairly heard before our conclusion is drawn.

This rule is evidently made to suit a case;—not as a way of finding out what the Bible means; but of making it mean what we have already assumed. But it is useless, since whichever side you wish to adopt,—whether the goodness or severity of God? (for he has both)? the supremacy of the Father or of the Son; you have only to take first those texts that lean your way, and then bring all others into a consistency with *this conclusion from half the evidence*.

Another application of this method is, in examining for instance, what Christianity is, to take such plain statements, as are contained in Peter's sermon at Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost: in which Christ is described as a *man approved of God*; and then to *reduce* all other statements to this; a proceeding evidently unreasonable, since no one denies that Christ is a man, the question being whether he is not also something else. And an appeal to this one sermon of Peter, supposes two things, namely that we have *all that sermon* recorded; and that the sermon contains *all truth*; but if so, we need have no larger Bibles, than just to contain that chapter.

But it is said, that Peter's sermon is plain, whilst all that is written

about Christ in the epistles, is confused by a reference to ancient Jewish ceremonies ; and therefore, what is asserted elsewhere, is to be interpreted by the plain statement of Christ's humanity. This rationalistic method, involves the false rule, that what is not asserted in the place we choose to pitch upon, is not stated anywhere else.

Another false method, is preferring the statements of Christ in the gospels, to those in the epistles ; as if Christ on earth, was complete as a teacher in words ; whereas he came to teach by acting : and *gave his life and death as the text*, from which he taught his Apostles to preach the sermon contained in the epistles. We are not therefore to look for *all truth in one place* ; as in the parable of the Prodigal, though there is no mention made of a mediator, *the mediator is not there denied*, and is sufficiently in other places, declared as the way unto the Father.

There is but one other case, by which we shall exemplify the misuse of free enquiry : namely, respecting the doctrine of redemption, a ransom, purchase, or buying off from the punishment of sin, by means of a true sacrifice. No one denies that the Scriptures do represent Christ's death in this light ; but some take it for granted that this is a highly figurative method of expression. But on what grounds ? For there is not a more explicit mention of a ransom or sacrifice in any other book ; why should it then be a fable in the Bible, and be intended as a fact in all other narrations ? The reason for thus diminishing the literal statements of Scripture, must arise from one or both of the following suppositions ; that the Bible is especially a figurative book ; and that figures, are necessarily hyperboles or exaggerations. Now neither of these suppositions is true : for first, if the Bible be peculiarly figurative, it is peculiarly unsuitable for the purpose it aims at,—namely, the enlightenment of mankind in general. Where figures are intended, the intention is obvious from the connexion and circumstances : and the meaning is often plainer on account of the figure.

The Bible teaches in two ways, by words, and facts or events : its instruction by words, includes parables, which have a clear moral lesson ; precepts which are obvious : promises which are plain, even when figurative : and prophecy which is necessarily indistinct ; but with which we have comparatively little to do. But in the narration of historical facts, the Bible is distinct and literal : and Christ's death is one of these : whilst the statements respecting its character and object, cannot well be mistaken ; the only question is, are they to be received ; and if received, have we any right to modify them ?

The second supposition, that figures are necessarily exaggerations or hyperboles, is also untrue : for these often fall short of the reality ; thus as to descriptions of heaven, though we may not expect literally a golden pavement, and palm branches, we may expect a splendour and triumph beyond what these emblems present. We have not here to lessen the sense, *there is no discount to be taken off such figures*. So again, Old Testament emblems, of New Testament blessings, *mean a reality beyond the image* : beating swords into ploughshares, means not only cessation from actual warfare, and engagement in the pursuits of productive industry ; but also the cessation of revengeful feelings ; and the exercise of good will to men. The future kingdom ; with its throne, sceptre, and

other paraphernalia of power and authority,—though not intending a real throne, or sceptre, or crown, or army; meant more than these real things do, when in the hands of ordinary kings: namely, a true government, that extend to men's thoughts, and a subjugation that should conquer men's affections.

In all such cases therefore, the figures are not above, but under the facts. And when Christ slays men with the sword of his mouth, though we do not mean a sword, we mean what is more efficient—the force of truth.

So again, of the figures, used in ascribing physical attributes to God; these figures, convey more real meaning, than if taken in their literal sense: thus God looketh down from heaven: his eyes are upon the good and evil;—a very imperfect suggestion to our minds, of God's intimate acquaintance with us. His arm is not shortened:—this whilst not teaching that God has an arm, teaches more than such a physical organ can effect,—that God can do more than men, with all their physical instruments: and thus the hand, which is man's signal of power and skill, is a help towards understanding the unlimited power of Jehovah. Indeed the greater part of human language, consists of figures of this sort; thus nearly all we say about our minds, is only a series of figures, drawn from sensible things, and yet this figurative language implies a reality, often more intense than the figure: in fact it is impossible to find exact illustrations for any such subjects. The Scriptures then, are not peculiarly figurative, and figures are not falsehoods nor exaggerations; but indicate equal realities; and though the Christian's armour is not steel; he is to be really armed in mind, as much as the ancient warriors were in body. If then we can carry out this principle, and shew that Scriptural figures do often fall below the facts they indicate, why should we think that our Lord's *purchasing us* with his own blood, does not also indicate a real and equal fact, though this representation should be called a figure?

Such are some of the suggestions we would respectfully offer to those who whilst seriously seeking the truth, may be misled by the false methods we have described;—methods adopted frequently in reference to the Bible: but which could not be admitted in examining any other book: the aim of it, is rather to rationalize the Bible; or make it square with a false standard of reason, than a reasonable method of finding out what it means.

So far, we have seen, that these Bereans were called noble, because they examined the Scriptures: we have noticed men's natural disinclination to independent enquiry; the obstacles placed in the way of this enquiry, by the assumed authority of governments and priesthoods: and the false methods of enquiry, adopted by some professing Christians. Consisting chiefly of a partial process, taking whichever passages seem to lean their way, drawing a conclusion from these, and then squaring others to them, instead of examining all, before drawing the conclusion: and also assuming that certain statements are figurative, and therefore to be qualified,—for no other reason, than because they are not in accordance with preconceived opinions. And what are the advantages of this false method, except to rob us of the divinity of Christ, and the atone-

ment made by him, which are the glory of the Bible and the hope of fallen man?

We have now in conclusion, to notice (4.) fourthly, the right methods of examining the Scriptures, and the motives which should lead us to this enquiry. And here we may notice in general; that the methods we have examined, will serve by contrast to point out the true way of proceeding. Treating the Bible as other books; looking for its true meaning, not in this or that place, but in all places: shewing no partiality to this or that; but taking Christianity as the perfect revelation of God, and comparing spiritual things with spiritual,—Scripture with Scripture, seeing therein—not what we should prefer, but what God has said. Nor will plain men, find more difficulty here, than in any other important enquiry; you have the whole Scriptures in your hand, turn over the pages and examine for yourselves: it is only when you come to refine and rationalise, that you will become perplexed as to the essential doctrines of salvation,—forgiveness through faith in Jesus Christ.

Many of the so-called orthodox, are misled by means of formal systems adopted amongst them: by the peculiar meaning they first attach to words, and then find the doctrines, by finding the words: also by adopting passages in a secondary meaning; or apart from their connexion. Then again, creeds and catechisms are often adopted, as the ultimate boundary of truth; hence some search the Scriptures, not to see *whether these things are so*, but to prove that they are so. These forms of doctrine, may be useful to direct enquiry, but they are pernicious, when they set enquiry aside. Some also, who naturally oppose reason and philosophy, feel insulted by a text that is too liberal: and will occasionally shew their regard for “the whole counsel of God,” by leaving his house, as soon as the text is mentioned: and why?—because they know full well, that this text, contains none of *their* whole counsel, but some wholesome advice for less perfect believers. This however is a case of extreme prejudice; and yet that spirit is but beginning to grow, which is willing to be taught; and to hear or read what has not before occurred to the mind: men we hope are becoming less bound to forms, to creeds, and worn out words; and tending more to the enlarged spirit and living truth of the gospel: which will not be cramped to the utterance of any *invented* orthodoxy; but demands to be spoken in the unfettered language of heaven, to the universal soul of man.

The true spirit of enquiry then, is evidently not to decide on the answer beforehand; nor with a measuring line of our reason falsely so called, to diminish and rationalise the answer; but with a docile spirit, and an earnest enquiry, approaching this oracle of wisdom, with ears attent to catch the divine voice amidst the babel-tongues of prejudice which disturb us from within, or from without.

The best canon of criticism, so far as the cultivation of our senses, to appreciate Bible utterances,—the best canon of criticism is prayer: not so much for throwing light on every difficulty, as for attuning our souls to perceive the grand truths of the Bible: religious truth, is best apprehended, through religious dispositions.

The next canon of criticism, or guide in enquiry; is a settled reverence for the Scriptures themselves: regarding them as the word of God; and

dealing with their statements with a chastened awe of the author who thus condescends to instruct a benighted world.

Another direction for this successful enquiry,—*is living up to the truth we have already attained.* Then shall ye know the doctrine if ye are willing—desirous to do the commandment. In religion as in all learning, *they are best prepared for the second lesson, who have PRACTISED the first.* But if to this first measure of light, we shut our eyes, they become sealed: if the gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, whose eyes the god of this world hath blinded; who cannot see truth through the atmosphere of deceitful lusts: who in listening to other allurements, have forgotten how to listen to the God of the Bible. We must seek therefore to have put away from us all blinding influence of impiety and ungodliness; and with child-like simplicity, approach the Father of lights, through a prayerful and humble study of his word.

Humility is an open door, in at which CHRIST who is THE TRUTH, will enter:—thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes;—spiritual character, is the avenue, to further spiritual discernment, for to him that hath (gained usury)—to him shall be given still more, and he shall have abundance.

Nor have we far to seek, for motives to engage in this enquiry: it is the word of God: a long letter from our Father, full of mercy, and intended for our daily guide. It is a revelation in *the Bible*, not in our thoughts, and is therefore to be apprehended only by studying the Bible. How differently those truths affect us, which we hear from others, to those which we find and experience for ourselves! Knowledge obtained by ease and at second-hand, leaves a slight impression and soon vanishes; whilst that at which we have laboured, becomes incorporated into our souls. And thus the word of God, may become to us, the “ENGRAFTED word.”

And notice lastly, it is the word of our salvation; it is our code of laws, and our charter of privileges; it is the constitution, according to which God will administer the affairs of this world.

It is the best gift of God to man; the only possession here suited to our nature; other blessings appeal to our senses, or are at most commodities of the present life: this, is the feast of the soul: it is the treasure house of hopes and promises; it is our chest of gold, and casket of jewels: it is our directory to a treasure in heaven: it is our entrance to life eternal; it is the mine wherein God has heaped together all the resources of his bounty, and therefore we are to search the Scriptures, to dig as for hid treasure, hid that it may be searched for and found, and that in finding it, we may be enriched for ever.

II.

HUMAN AUTHORITY AND INVENTION *versus* CONSCIENCE AND THE BIBLE.

The Scriptures are the only standard of Christian faith and practice : every one is at liberty to examine them ; but no one is at liberty to decline this examination : and though we may receive the help of others, we may not rest on their authority, (which is man-worship ;) nor receive as religion, what is not in the Scriptures, (which is will-worship.)

PRELACY BASED ON FORGERY.

"My own conviction is, that every kind of pious fraud is as much at variance, ultimately, with sound policy, as it is with Christian principle."—ARCHBISHOP WHATELY.

FOR three long centuries have the claims of prelacy to be deemed an Apostolical institution been matter of unintermitted controversy, and countless names, many of them the most illustrious on the rolls of fame have been ranged on opposite sides of the question. It has seemed as though an issue were to be for ever despaired of. Doubtless not a little of true learning, candour, and charity have been applied to the solution of the problem, but far more of passion, prejudice, selfishness, and pride, have obscured its true merits. Never have there been wanting besides a few sober and truthful advocates, crowds of sycophant writers in behalf of a system which has ample preferment to bestow, and has never shewn a disinclination to raise to the disputed throne, the janissary who has defended it. How many more have clutched the mitre as zealous upholders of the three orders of the clergy, than as able defenders of the three persons in the Godhead.

In spite however of these great odds in its favour, the hierarchical party has never been able to silence the opposition. Not only on the inspired page, where but for the aid of a patristical lens, neither jot nor tittle of prelacy could ever have been espied by prejudice herself, have the recusants shielded from destructive glosses, those unmistakeable texts which prove that 'bishops' and 'presbyters' were originally but two different names of one and the same office,* but also in the earliest

* "That the name of *Episcopoi*, or bishops, was altogether synonymous with *presbyters*, is clearly evident from those passages of Scripture, where both appellations are used interchangeably. (Acts xx. comp. v. 17, with v. 28 ; Ep. to Titus c. i. v. 5, with v. 7. 1 Pet. c. v. v. 1, with v. 2.)—and from those where the office of deacon is named immediately after that of bishop, so that between these two Church offices, there could

Christian antiquity, where the prelatists have always breathed more freely, has our position been sturdily maintained. Again and again has the summons to us to surrender at least this latter field of argument, been laughed to scorn. And now, less than ever, does there seem to be a prospect of reducing the malcontents to submission.* This at least is not the time to quit our ground now that, thanks to the greed of the good monks of Nitria, the munificence of the nation, the enterprise of Archdeacon Tattam, and the learned and honest labours of Mr. Cureton, we can spitefully mark how bravely, from the red throat of that masterful Syrian mortar, "leaps the live thunder," which of the only hostile fortress that soiled the sod of freedom, the unsightly Ignatian Acropolis, with its eighteen towers, on whose skilful embattlement such engineers as an Usher and a Pearson, with a host of subordinates only inferior to their chiefs, lavished the choicest stores of their art, leaves but one tottering turret as an eye-sore in the scene. To speak more plainly, out of this formidable number of passages extant in the hitherto pretty exten-

not still be a third intervening one. (Ep. to Philip i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 8.) Neander's Church History.—(Vol. i. p. 251.) Clarke's Library Translation. Our profound Hellenists, such as the Editor of *Æschylus* (the Bishop of London) ought to have told us poor outsiders long ago, that the term *presbuteros* a comparative adjective, hardly squares with the "good, better, best" theory, till the other two members of the same series shall be fairly set upon their feet. We must have the three legs of the Tripod, or the Pythian will make Delphi and all Greece ring with laughter, instead of teeming with gifts. But in truth, in the temple of the Lord there is no Tripod at all. A *living body* can stand on *two* legs, whilst a *thing* requires at least *three*. Bishop Hinds (History of the Rise and Early Progress of Christianity, pp. 144—148.) kindly helps us to the strictly correlative N. T. term *Neoteros*,—(Acts v. 6.) which he proves to have been synonymous with the term Deacon, of later times, (see the two terms, *presbuteroi* and *Neoterioi*, side by side, 1 Pet. v. 1—5.) though in apostolic times the substantive *Diaconos*, or "servant," was applied to *both* the two orders, the members of which were thus respectively the *SeniOR* and *JuniOR*, or *UppER* and *LOWER* Servants of the Church. Now we contemplate an appeal to the Amphictyonic Council, in case it should be denied that two definite comparatives, of opposite attributes, applied to the same class of subjects are *exhaustive* of that class: i.e. denote its numerical complements. Where then are the prelates to find room? They would hardly like to squeeze in between the *Seniores* and *Juniores*; besides, that it would be "easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle," than to get in that way. Still less we presume would they choose to be below them. Hence, though the *APOSTLES* were content with the titles *Presbuteros* (1 Pet. v. 1. 2 John i. 1. 3 John i.) and *Diaconos* (Acts vi. 4. 2 Cor. iv. 1.) there is no help for it, but to put their assumed successors amongst the "Lords over God's heritage," or—nowhere.

* The reference, as will immediately be seen, is to a recent literary discovery of paramount interest and importance. The advocates of prelacy have always appealed to the writings of the Apostolic Father Ignatius, as proving that the division of the clergy into *three* orders must have been instituted by the Apostles themselves, inasmuch as the interval between the death of St. John and that of Ignatius, (about ten years,) is too short to render the introduction of so considerable a change, as the establishment of a new office in the Church (viz. that of prelates) conceivable. This argument their opponents met by alleging that the writings of Ignatius had been so interpolated that no dependence could be placed upon the passages cited, which they refused to admit had ever proceeded from his pen. This question has been lately set at rest by the production of new and quite decisive evidence. An extremely ancient Syriac translation of the Epistles of Ignatius has been brought to light. It was obtained by Archdeacon Tattam, from the Monastery of Nitria, in Egypt, and has been published by Mr. Cureton, a clergyman of the Church of England, and chaplain to the Queen. This version omits the suspected passages, (with the single exception referred to below,) and thus proves them to be forgeries.

sively received recension of the epistles of Ignatius, (who was martyred in A.D. 107,) in which the three orders of the clergy are expressly enumerated, or at least bishops spoken of as distinct from Presbyters, *seventeen* refuse to look honestly in the face any of the several copies of the extremely ancient Syriac Version, lately brought from the Valley of the Ascetics, in Egypt, and now safely lodged in the library of the British Museum.

But one out of the eighteen passages remains,

"Like the last rose of summer all blooming alone."

We deem it quite a providence that it is left standing, albeit "all alone in its glory." The exception is a happy one.

Such a passage in this Syriac recension whose most providential discovery (as Mr. Cureton proves in the masterly Introduction to his *Corpus Ignatianum*,) renders hopeless any further defence of more than three epistles, by Ignatius, viz.: those to the Ephesians, to the Romans, and to Polycarp, whilst it also confines the rightful bounds even of these, to very narrow compass, silences for ever the strange insinuation (a straw at which drowning men have caught,) that the ancient Oriental Translator, in a spirit we presume of low dissenting spleen against prelates, burked these golden testimonies of the holy martyr.

Mr. Cureton quietly puts the painful matter in its true light. The poor Syriac Translator is in truth no Congregational Guy Fawkes, laying in that obscure age his artful trains to blow up in *this* the House of Convocation.

To use a somewhat homely but trenchant phrase, "the boot is on the other leg."

He is not a conspirator, but a very useful member of the detective police. Though not one of the gang, and doubtless tied to no blabbing Fulvia, he will make a good Curius.

The upshot is, that the *Prelatical Cataline* is fairly unearthed.

That HIERARCHIAL PLOT which Dailleé, Salmasius and others, two centuries ago tried to bring home to the culprits, but (as often happens) through the cunning of the accused, and Time's transient weakness of memory, failed as many thought to fasten on the offenders, is now matter of noontide FACT; and is scored on the marbles of HISTORY, in marks deep and legible as the brand on the forehead of Cain. Murder will out. The voice of this twice slain martyr hath not cried, "How long?" from under the altar in vain. The white robe hath been given him, and he stands once more amongst the shouting children of the bride-chamber, "pure from the blood of all men." "Verily there is a God that judgeth in the earth." This fresh witness of grave aspect, shaming by his snowy hairs, and few but weighty words, the eager and frothy babblings of his beardless gainsayers, cannot have been tampered with; for he gives evidence for and against both sides. The forgers then are caught and cast.

But what teeming thoughts rush unbidden into the mind, as we reflect upon this painful case. Alas! what could have moved these very ancient Christians thus to forge pinchbeck proofs of episcopacy, when they must have had so many golden testimonies staring them in the face, in the now lost but then extant writings of men who were conversant with the

Apostles, or at least with the next generation of Church teachers, as the *genuine* Dionysius Areopagita, Papias, Quadratus, Aristides and Castor, Aristo Pellæus and others. Even from the pestilent books of the heretics of the same early times, the great Catholic Institution might have been lawfully evidenced, as a plain matter of fact. Valentinus, Marcion, Basilides, Isidore his son, Julianus Cassianus, and many more might have been pressed into the service.

But in fact there would have been no need of either class of authorities. The Diptychs, or *Church Registers*, belonging to every Church planted by the Apostles, might have been got together, in every one of which would have been found the names of a regular succession of bishops, priests, and deacons, from the very day of their foundation.

But forgery was preferred; eighteen texts in favour of prelacy being foisted into the Ignatian documents; that men might discover in the traditions of the Fathers, a supplement to the simplicity of Christ. These Ignatian documents however, not only fail to support prelacy; they are its extirpation "ROOT AND BRANCH." Men do not forge where they have proper evidence; nor manufacture what comes naturally to hand. Manchester would soon be as badly off as if "engulphed like the cities of the plain," were any of our Loudons to discover a shirt-tree. So too when these forgeries were perpetrated, sterling reasons for prelacy could hardly have been "plenty as blackberries," unless indeed these jolly old knights of the quill are to be allowed the benefit of the well-known "compulsion" hypothesis. Here then we see the engineer "hoist with his own petard."

Nor is the remark of Gibbon, touching another imposture—the forgery of the Decretals and of the Donation of Constantine; the one the foundation of the spiritual and the other of the temporal power of the Pope's, altogether inapplicable to this cheat that has so newly come to light. "The merchandise was indeed profitable, and a few sheets of paper were sold for much wealth and power." Usually, as our readers know, paper is made out of linen,—here to our astonishment, paper is made into *lawn*: and worked up into bishops' sleeves.

To heighten the marvel, we next behold the *substratum* of the lawn alone remain, with bank notes as *accidents*. As the "last scene of all, that ends this strange eventful history," the taint of FORGERY (which alone gave dramatic unity to the whole) shall be espied in Threadneedle Street, substance and accidents vanish like the halo of golden light round the dirty bulbs of Harlaem, and the "dull reality" of equally dirty paper, become the whole assets of a like bankrupt, but far more shabby speculation.

Giant Prelate is now fairly on his knees, his sword in hostile hands; and his life at the mercy of his conqueror. Eighteen passages in Father Ignatius, once formed his ample defence, so many thicknesses of parchment for his shield; seventeen of them have peeled off, and the remaining one now awaits our tender consideration. Justice must be done to this single passage—the small lot of "salvage" from the wreck.

Mr. Cureton knows of some clergymen who believe in the inspiration of Ignatius! To them, this "one text" is of course "Scripture," and will "prove any doctrine." But they must at least, first shew that

Ignatius wrote it, which he assuredly never did. This text was very likely in the copy of the Syriac Translator, but it never was in the Martyr's autograph. Good use has already been made of the fact, that the Syriac Translator recognises such a passage: on that spot the battery is planted, which rakes with its destructive fire, the enemy's camp.

But when the seventeen are gone, the *one* stands naked and defenceless. For I. it is not merely its solitariness which renders it suspicious; but the passage stands **ALONE**, in a set of documents now **KNOWN** to have been falsified in favour of that prelacy, for which this isolated passage is adduced.

II. This passage is condemned by its tone and the awkward manner of its introduction,—in the midst of a personal letter to Polycarp. "Look ye (so runs this suspicious testimony) to the bishop, that God also may look upon you. I WILL ANSWER FOR THE SOULS of those who are subject to the bishops, and the presbyters, and the deacons."*

Here both the hand of a clumsy interpolator, and the "great swelling words of vanity" of a godless hireling are unmistakable.

III. Not only these words, but the entire latter half of the Syriac Recension of this epistle, is every letter of it **SPURIOUS**. For the ancient Latin version, published by Faber of Etaples, three centuries and a half ago, **ENDS significantly enough with the LAST WORD OF THE THIRD CHAPTER.**

Leaving out the solitary defence of bishops, priests, and deacons! This evidence against the genuineness of the single passage on prelacy, is the more valuable, because this very Latin version is *everywhere else the most interpolated of all*. Its testimony here therefore is beyond suspicion.

IV. The portion of the epistle thus wanting in the old Latin text, bristles with those uncouth *Latinisms*, which had long since rendered doubtful the genuineness of the Ignatian writings.

No *Latinisms* are found in those parts of the Ignatian documents which are recognized by all the texts. They are found only on the confiscated territory. So that here we find another, a later and clumsier hand, providentially defeating itself in setting up prelatical episcopacy on the pedestal of forgery.

V. The use of the term *agneia* in the fifth Chapter, not in the New Testament and early Christian sense of "chastity," but in the *monkish* sense of "celibacy," every dabbler in these matters knows to be a palpable anachronism. This new meaning is of too late a date to come from the pen of Ignatius. Priests had not then put false meanings upon the New Testament words. It was in after-times, that purity was translated into celibacy: and a bishop over a congregation, into a prelate over such bishops. These elements of popery—ascetism and spiritual lordship—grew up together in later ages.

Therefore these forgers overshot the mark and outwitted themselves; when they **INVENTED A HIERARCHY** as the twin monster with celibacy, and put them into the writings of Ignatius, who died before they were born! We shall just give the passage, and leave our readers to judge for themselves.

"If any be able to abide in celibacy *agneia* in honour of the Lord's

* Ad. Polycarp, cap. vi.

condition in the flesh, let him so abide without boasting. If he boast, he is undone; and if he allow himself to be held in greater esteem than the bishop, (!) he is ruined."

The cause of the bishops is ruined, being based on such modern insertions into ancient writings. We are told lugubriously enough in these days, that the introduction of one bishop (as by the Pope) into the diocese of another, (as of one belonging to the English Church,) invalidates the orders of the invaded bishop: whereas *all such bishops are usurpers*; territorial jurisdiction, authority over one grade of clergy by another, is an invasion of the constitution of Christ; an aggression on the equality and liberty of Christians.

Any hierarchy is an assumption; and the gradations of lordship are based on forgery.

This conspiracy against the rule of Christ, and the freedom of his followers, may be consistently rebuked in the language of a virtuous heathen; words always chosen by type-founders, to exhibit a specimen of their art;—the beauty and variety of their leaden charges provided for every honest musket that is levelled at the foes of truth and goodness, of man and God.

Quousque tandem abutere CATALINA, patientia nostra? Quamdiu etiam furor iste tuus nos eludet? quem ad finem sese effrenata jactabit audacia? nihil te nocturnum presidium palatii, nihil urbis vigiliæ, nihil timor populi, nihil consensus bonorum omnium, nihil his munitissimus habendi senatus locus, nihil horum ora vultusque moverunt? PATERE tua consilia non sentis? Constrictam jam omnium harum conscientia teneri CONJURATIONEM TUAM non vides? Quid proxima, quid superiore nocte egeris, ubi fueris, quos convocaveris, quid CONSILII ceperis, quem nostrum ignorare arbitraris? O TEMPORA! O MORES! Senatus hæc intelligit, consul videt, hic tamen vivit; vivit? imo vero etiam IN SENATUM VENIT: fit PUBLICI CONSILII *particeps*: notat et designat oculis ad cædem unumquemque nostrum. *Nos autem viri fortes satisfacere Reipublicæ videmur si istius furorem ac tela vitemus!*

As a free Christian adaptation of the sentiments of the Roman patriot, perhaps the following rendering might serve—"to what greater lengths Judas, do you mean to proceed in your abuse of our patience? How long is that senseless wickedness of your's, to wear the mask? When are you to cease bragging that your mountain stands so strong, you can never be moved? Have the cries of God's elect day and night, the wakeful eyes that guard the city of God, the misgivings of the simple Christian people, the accordant aims of the good of every party, the inviolable safety of the secret place of the Most High, the gaze of the indignant cloud of witnesses, no terrors for you? See you not that your plots are laid bare? That already your treason is foiled by being brought to the knowledge of all men? Who does not know what you were about in the darkness of the forger's den, the tools you egged on to do it, and the pious end you had in view? O what times, what religion we have lived to see! Everybody, from the Sovereign downwards, knows these things. And yet the conspirator lives! *Lives*, did I say, he even sits in the Parliament; he makes laws for the Church; he counts us as sheep for the slaughter. And we, excellent Christians as we are, think we have

done enough for the Commonwealth of Israel, if we can but manage to get out of the way of his rage."

After all prelacy still lives,

——— "magnificently proud,"

and carries its head high like a giraffe! So will the fly-wheel of some Titan steam engine spin some time merrily round,—*after the boiler has burst.*

The College of Augurs (the prelates of the old Roman Paganism) held many a conclave after the day when Cicero and his Right Rev. brethren felt their muscles so sorely taxed as they chaunted the pious Cantilena.

But *at last*, the lever of *truth* planted on the fulcrum of *doubt*, heaved a world of FALSEHOOD into the limbo of vanity.

Thus much is very certain;—the Ignatian way from Jerusalem to Canterbury, is no longer a royal road. The valley of the Ascetics presents an impassable gulf. It is a veritable Slough of Despond, in which the prelatical pilgrim may "tumble," but whence he will never emerge. At best, crosier and mitre, and lawn and apron, must be left sticking in the mire. No "steps" placed there by "the king," can be tracked across the slime. PLIABLE may wallow there, but it is not the place for CHRISTIAN.

The researches of Mr. Cureton stand as a warning to all travellers, to avoid that road.

The Monks of Nitria have preserved the work of that Oriental Martin Mar-prelate; whose Syriac Translation of Ignatius, is now safe in our British Museum; as a providentially preserved protest against our "spiritual peers." Mr. Cureton has done good service in bringing before the learned world these important facts, some results of which we have here presented to our readers.

At no future visitation dinner, sparkling with "good old Church port, and plenty of it," will episcopal ears ever be shocked with the unseasonable toast—"the Monks of Nitria!" The lordly prelate, must now seek some safer foundation, than a forged cheque in the name of Father Ignatius.

III.

“EVERY PLANT WHICH MY HEAVENLY FATHER HATH NOT PLANTED,
SHALL BE ROOTED UP.”—(Matt. xv. 13.)

In those who think a national Church right, dissent is a sin ; in those who think it wrong, silence is a shame.

CHURCH POLITY.

BY ANDREW COVENTRY DICK, Esq.*

THE re-publication of this work, will be hailed by all earnest and intelligent enquirers into the central problem of the age,—the relation of Government to Religion.

The investigation is entered into with all the clearness of the logician, and the calmness of the philosopher, joined with the sincerity of the patriotic Christian.

Such a searching and dispassionate examination of this great question, will do much towards removing prejudices, and preparing the way for its final adjustment.

The little wisdom by which the world is governed, is sufficiently indicated by the fact, that we have *still to settle the province of Government*.

The primary distinction between savage and civilised life consists in a greater fixedness of the dwellings and habits of the people, as well as of the supreme power and the constitutional administration of justice. But a whole nation may be barbarians, when no longer savages, and this they are, wherever the fixed government or constitution is in the power and management of an absolute hereditary autocrat. In this state of things the people are serfs, and the autocrat their proprietor, who taxes at his sovereign pleasure, or sends them forth to battle as sheep to the slaughter. The next step in political society is the uprising of antagonist powers in shape of lords or barons who wish to share in the sovereignty, constituting so many principalities under the sovereign, and modifying his absolute will by their several interests and purposes. This is the second stage, wherein the aristocratic element enters into the ruling power. Nations that make any advance, next reach to another stage—a middle class, of industry, intelligence, and commerce—whose combined power demands a further extension of the ruling authority ; and thus there is added to a House of Lords a House of Commons, which involves in *name* a further development from the awakened intelligence of the labouring classes, and so in theory embraces the element democracy—the sovereignty distribu-

* A Dissertation on Church Polity. By Andrew Coventry Dick, Esq, Advocate. Ward and Co. Paternoster-row, London.

ted over the whole nation, to be exercised finally in a full representation of all men and all interests.

To this stage of theory the English constitution has for some time advanced, and now it depends on the energy and concentration of the unrepresented to carry this acknowledgment into practice. At present, however, there is a monstrous divorce between our political faith and works. The aristocratic element is predominant; it has overshadowed the throne, and rendered it almost nominal; it has encroached on the people, overflowed the banks of the Upper House, and nearly filled the House of Commons, whilst it has carefully secured the main positions of place, emolument, and monopoly. It possesses the land, and the sea, and the heavens—the army, navy, and the Church.

This last possession, the Church, which cannot so much be said to have property, as to be *possessed* by the aristocracy, is what we propose inquiring into; and to secure the patient hearing of every Englishman, we may observe it is the Church of England, that is, of Englishmen. The question is national, and therefore belongs exclusively to no sect; it is allied to no peculiar theology, but relates to our common duty as men and Christians. The churchman who forsakes the inquiry in contented ignorance is faithless to the system he passively upholds: the dissenter, who is apathetic, is a traitor to his own position, and a standing protest against the liberty he has assumed: the politician and patriot who leaves this question to chance, or to ecclesiastics, deals only with surfaces of political inquiries: the statesman who evades the subject, or patches up the difficulty by expedients, displays his incompetency to manage a great empire, and especially in perilous times when we must either have growth or organic changes.

It has been acknowledged by all of the least liberality of sentiment, and has been demonstrated by the entire course of history, that the civil or political concerns of a people are best managed in proportion as there is popular supervision and control; that irresponsible power is a natural incentive to injustice: that a *close* borough is only another name for a *rotten* borough. Whether religious authority and Church money be an exception to this rule, it behoves every one to consider; for, if not, there is as much necessity for popular management and control of religion as of politics. And further, it must be remembered, that all kinds of liberty advance or recede together, and, therefore, while a nation's conscience is enslaved it must be venal and crouching. Every parish contains an irresponsible agent, placed there by the patronage of the aristocracy or government, which is the same thing. Hence we have a conservative principle in society, another ramification of the aristocratic element, in a spiritual garb, whose professions of regard for our spiritual welfare are repaid by political influence, family berths, and sales of livings. The laity have no voice in the whole matter; no one has power but the prime minister, the Court of Arches, and the Privy Council. This court lately decided against the so-called evangelical clergy; making them all illegal heretics; and so removing one of those apologies caught at by the serious laity, the occasional appointment of a "Gospel Minister." This phenomenon, however,—which from the time of Bishop Burnet to our own, has mainly occurred where there was any danger from Dissent—

was for a time, by the authority of the Ecclesiastical Court, declared illegal: and every so-called Evangelical clergyman was bound in conscience to leave the Church, or to leave his principles. But they waited to see what the only other court would decide. But shall our National Church be tossed about from Protestantism to Popery, between these two children playing at battledore in the Market-place with "the Church," that is, the creed and worship of a nation, as the shuttlecock between them? We have not here to deal with any particular theological views; so far we cannot take sides with Puseyites or Evangelicals, High, Low, or Middle Church party: but it is in the province of every man to enquire—shall the money annexed by Parliament to "the Church," as contained in the Prayer-book, homilies, articles, and canons, be turned over to this or that set of opinions, as one or other clerical sect is predominant? or shall we—seeing one half of the nation is paying for its own religion, and the workers in the establishments are the worst paid of any—shall we allow this system, which the nation has outgrown, to continue for the benefit of a few over-paid bishops and cathedral drones; or make such alterations as shall change curates into bishops and bishops into lay peers? The question is a long and a grave one, not without its deep interest and significance to those who regard the spirituality of religion; and a plain matter of business and common sense, looked at in the light of economy as a matter of justice, and pounds, shillings, and pence. They are very much mistaken who look at it as a mere Dissenters' question. The Church laity would be better served, and the working clergy would be better paid, if *twelve millions annually*, with capability of indefinite increase, were applied to other purposes.

Whilst we shall not fail to give the money part of the question some prominence, we are also prepared to deal with its higher relations. The subject is gaining popular attention to a very great degree; the agitation is now organised in a form of life and power; the Anti-State Church Association has convened meetings all over the country, and obtained crowded and sympathising audiences; men of all denominations must either join it or grapple with it; the clergy are venturing upon pamphlets, and the conflict is fairly coming on; new weapons are employed; free trade in religion must now be met on the platform—no longer by the dungeon and scaffold.

Everything will be allowed to stand, if it *can* stand, on its own bottom. All false props will be withdrawn, and religion in its simple truth and native force, appear again, not as the bribed ally of secular tyranny—priestcraft, the buttress of statecraft—but as the champion of the weak, the heaven-sent opponent of despotism, and conservator of order founded on justice.

Whilst, therefore, the people are claiming and acquiring the suffrage, we would contribute our mite in preparing them to use it; for the suffrage has to be extended, not only to more individuals, but to more subjects—to everything national, and, therefore, to the National Church.

When the people come to understand that **POOR-RATES** and church-rates were originally intended to be paid out of the property apportioned to the Church, and that these rights of the poor have been stolen by the "poor man's Church," whilst another tax has been imposed on parish-

ioners; with many other related questions, surely some more general excitement will be awakened: and if the clergy dare not speak, the people will venture upon *declaring by votes*, what their views really are.

In order to prepare the popular mind for a clear understanding of this subject, we cannot do better than present to our readers the main features of Mr. Dick's argument: nor will this we hope be without its advantage to such as may be induced to peruse the work for themselves.

The "Introduction" points out the suggestive circumstance, that the distinction between Church and State, is a doctrine peculiar to the age of Christianity. Before this time, secular and spiritual matters were united together, as the common elements of nationality: occasionally the spiritual feature being in the ascendant, and at other times, the political influence predominating.

In Greece and Rome the secular influence prevailed, making superstition a subordinate department: but it was difficult to reduce Christianity to the same subordinate place, when that was adopted in the Roman Empire: since the Church had already a distinct agency, code and government of its own; and must consequently be taken into alliance with the political powers. The spiritual functionaries became thus the medium through which Government managed religion: and from this arose two interests, the secular and the religious,—the State and the Church, instead of the ancient simple nationality, in which there was no separation of these authorities.

Ever since the days of Constantine, the extent of these distinct authorities, Church and State, has been the most perplexing problem.

To remove these difficulties the work before us enters into the grounds of that relation between religion and politics which has caused so much evil, and is now involved in such practical confusion.

The ancient doctrine of a State, as being simple in its nature and not composed of different authorities is taken as the groundwork: those principles only are admitted which are applicable to all men as citizens. The religious element might be a part of Pagan government, without introducing any element of disunion, since the worship of the heathen gods seems to have been rather a matter of fashion and patriotism than of conscience.

But when men had learned "*What is TRUTH?*" and felt the nature of conscientious scruples in religion, it became an impossibility to mould all consciences by acts of legislation. Henceforth religion was no principle of civil union, but a matter of private conscience, in which governments could not interfere without civil discord and spiritual usurpation.

The union of the Church with the State impaired the freedom and efficiency of both; enforcing religious despotism by civil disabilities; adding to the difficulties of rulers, and diminishing from the freedom of subjects, whilst subsidizing and degrading religion itself, as the handmaid of oppression.

There are two classes of churchmen who maintain the propriety of Civil Government entering into the province of religion:—high churchmen who regard it as the duty of political rulers to maintain *the true religion*; and low churchmen who advocate the support of *some* national religion as a matter of *civil utility*; a help to the Government in the shape of a spiritual police.

The principles of these two classes are accordingly examined in a series of sections on the following topics:—

Section I. Authority of the Magistrate in matters of religion.

II. The Argument from Scripture.

III. The argument from Civil utility.

IV. Idea of an Established Church.

V. The Creed of an Established Church.

VI. The Endowment of an Established Church.

VII. The Subordination of an Established Church.

VIII. and IX. An established Church as a scheme of Instruction.

X. The Political effects of an Established Church.

The first section, on the *authority of the magistrate*, or province of Government, is exceedingly important as a firm and plain basis for all the rest.

The following are the chief points asserted or suggested on this growingly interesting and practical subject.

The High Church theory assumes that Government has authority over its subjects in matters of religion; and that it is bound to maintain true religion, as a national homage to the Divine Being.

Accordingly the magistracy is a kind of priesthood, using its peculiar power of pay and punishment, besides commissioning another especial order of priesthood to employ the power of persuasion and ecclesiastical discipline.

But there is one plain distinction between religion and many if not all civil duties, which clearly disproves any such Government authority: viz.—that no act of religion is of any avail, except as it is from the heart; whilst most civil actions answer their ends, whatever be the moral intention of the author. The payment of a bill stands good in law, even when the payment is “grudgingly and of necessity:” whilst the money is equally serviceable to the receiver. Now Government is able to exact such performances to “the uttermost farthing.” But it cannot enter the conscience and force love to God, or reception of the gospel. It may bring men to outward acts of devotion; but since religion consists in something else, which no human power can reach, it is evidently beyond all human authority, because beyond all human control.

Physical constraint, is the sole power of the magistrate, and is no part of religion.

The distinction between “perfect and imperfect rights” as laid down by Paley, is important and useful here: those are called perfect rights, *which can be clearly defined and enforced*; those are *imperfect rights*, which cannot be so defined; which depend upon a thousand circumstances and moral relations known only to Omniscience. **THE ENFORCEMENT OF THESE, BELONGS TO OMNISCIENCE ALONE.**

For instance, a man orders a coat or a piece of furniture, at a certain price; this is a definite sum, which may be enforced, as a clear point of civil duty, and by the civil power. But in a question of benevolence,—how much a man should give to a case of distress, or whether he is bound to give anything,—this is beyond the calculation and settlement of other men, and belongs to our stewardship under Divine Providence.

Children owe love to their parents, and parents affection to their chil-

dren; but the precise amount, and definite exhibition of these feelings, cannot be set down in a code of laws and enforced by a human tribunal.

The same is true of the relation in which we stand to the Creator, our debt of obligation cannot be put down on any balance sheet, nor enforced in any small or large debt court; but is made up of items of which only he can take cognizance, and is paid in methods which no human signature can certify.

And from this arises the fundamental maxim, that perfect rights, or definite outward actions, such as the State can take knowledge of and enforce,—external duties between man and man; **ARE OUR ONLY CIVIL OBLIGATIONS**; whilst imperfect obligations, relating to the more delicate questions of conscience, of which no schedule can be made, and to which no human power of enforcement can reach; *constitute OUR MORAL OBLIGATIONS—WHAT WE OWE TO GOD ALONE.* The performance or violation of which, he alone can know, and reward or punish.

Therefore Government, (in spiritual matters) is left with only this province,—to secure to every man the enjoyment of his religion, without molestation from others, or pains penalties and disadvantages from Government itself.

What then is the nature of that theory which assumes the contrary; and gives to the civil power an authority in religious matters?

It is as Mr. Dick properly states, the assumption that “a state is an association of men for the highest purposes:” that it constitutes a moral person, and as such is bound to sanctify the *national conscience*, by a national religion.

This fiction is very clearly exposed, by shewing the impossibility of carrying it out consistently.

The supposition that because men are religious or moral beings, therefore nations are such, is refuted by the fact, that every association of men, for a railway company or any trading speculation, would on this ground become a religious association.

The purpose then of any society, *is not to be decided by the nature of men, but by the particular objects for which the society is formed.*

And whatever be the purpose of society in general, may be pursued by every means requisite for the accomplishment of that purpose.

If religion be the highest end of the national compact, the civil authority is at liberty to employ every means of coercion requisite to enforce its spiritual purpose.

The only consistent position for Government to assume is, the maintenance of “outward peace between man and man,”—“the preservation of the society and every member thereof, in a free and peaceable enjoyment of all the good things of this life that belong to each of them.”

This is Locke’s definition of the ends of civil society, to which he adds, “beyond the concerns of this life, this society hath nothing to do at all.”

But it is objected by some, that such a constitution of society is “atheistic” and “immoral.”

That cannot be atheistic which is consistent with the will of God, as exhibited in the nature of man. Before anything be called immoral we must find some reasons against it: that is plainly moral which is in accordance with the intentions of Providence.

These intentions can easily be tested in the present case; for whatever authority is given to Government, a corresponding obligation is binding on subjects: if the ruler may make laws in religion, the subject may not disobey them: and therefore either Government has no such authority, or it is the duty of all subjects to accept the religion of the State. Our religious obligations will thus depend not upon truth, but upon geography.

In everything properly belonging to civil rulers, all subjects are bound to obey; society rests upon this foundation; if then religion be the province of Government, conscience is subordinate to civil authority.

But it is admitted on all hands, that there are occasions which justify the assertion of conscience against all interference: what then are these circumstances?

They must arise out of the constitution of man as expressive of the intentions of the Creator. "*In political as in natural science, nature cannot be governed, but by obeying her.*" The question then comes,—how far is the authority of Government in religion, consistent with the nature of man?

If conscience be supreme, then Government is not supreme: if the former have authority, the latter is excluded.

The first point for establishing a religion, is to fix upon a creed, and form of worship, as obligatory upon the whole society or nation. And if the magistrate is competent to decide upon this, it is the duty of all good subjects to accept such creed, and perform such worship.

But since religion requires *sincerity*, every subject is under obligation to assent heartily to the Government theology.

There ought consequently to be some fitness in the decision of rulers, to gain the consent of subjects; whereas the only reasons they can present as civil rulers, are the rewards or punishments annexed to their doctrines, which have no appropriate force of proof.

Having therefore no inherent power of gaining consent, laws are unfit means of enforcing religion.

But a second and equally fatal objection to any such Government authority, is presented by *the existence and nature of CONSCIENCE*; not only is there nothing in the nature of a legislative enactment to secure intellectual conviction, but in religious questions, conscience naturally inspires with aversion against those sentiments which we disbelieve. These "signals, planted by God himself," in the breast of man, are the very things which have provoked the tyranny of men, who have thus obtruded into the province reserved by Jehovah, as his peculiar dominion.

This contradiction of authorities,—conscience and the magistrate—produces civil discord, when by enforcing a religion against the convictions of men, the civil power infringes upon the natural liberties of the subject, and the inalienable prerogatives of the Creator.

This anomaly in civil society, produces what we see at present, practical disorder, the State supporting institutions, which a great number of subjects are openly and conscientiously seeking to overthrow!

But it will be said, that "poets, philosophers, and jurists, warn us to lay the foundation of civil society in an acknowledgment of Divine Providence."

We however can recognize Providence only by obeying its laws, and

since we are by this PROVIDED WITH A CONSCIENCE, evidently intended to be supreme in religious concerns, we best acknowledge and submit to Providence, by not infringing its highest laws.

True Atheism would enforce any form of religion from civil policy, because Atheism disregards both the conscience of man, and the authority of God.

This is the denial of Providence, and a subversion of all the Creator's laws.

Some however seek to evade this conclusion, by a compromise between law and conscience, pretending that the choice of a creed by the Legislature, does not commit all subjects to its acceptance; but only appends certain advantages to the State Creed.

This is a still greater anomaly, constituting a "Legislature without subjects; the right to govern, without the duty of obeying: *and if this be admitted for one law, it destroys the force of all laws*, and completely destroys the bond of civil society. Thus, toleration is introduced: but this is inconsistent with the duty of the State to regulate in affairs of religion, since in no other matter is toleration thought of.

Either the Government has no authority in religion, or it is criminal in admitting any doctrines contrary to those established. It is bound to carry out its religious laws, with the same rigour and exactness as any other, or to abandon such laws altogether.

An establishment is founded upon a denial of all claim to toleration, and the one or the other should be withdrawn. The power that may establish, cannot tolerate with any consistency. TOLERATION IS AN INSULT TO BOTH PRINCIPLES; it both denies men's freedom, and practically abandons the magistrate's authority.

A parent may not tolerate those vices in his children, which he is bound and able to correct. The original idea and practice of State—Churchism in England, admitted of no toleration; Dissent was rebellion, and now rebellion is legalized: but this has happened only because the State and the Church were too weak to carry out their claims; they have been wearied into TOLERATION, WHICH IS THE EARNEST OF FINAL EMANCIPATION.

IV.

Under this department, sceptical objections, and systems or principles advocated as hostile to Christianity, are dispassionately considered.

THE INFIDEL'S CANDOUR, AND SCRIPTURAL KNOWLEDGE.

THE following instance of candour and Scriptural knowledge, is presented to our readers, as another warning against the unfairness of some who are very earnest in *enlightening* the people on the errors of the Bible. We shall not pretend to enter into every mistake and fallacy contained in the quotation,—mistakes as to facts and doctrines in the Bible, fallacies of logic as to the process by which the Scriptures lead men into crimes.

There is no excuse for the ignorance or unfairness exhibited in the whole piece, which is a libel at once on the word of God, and the common sense of men. Those who argue against the Scriptures, ought first to understand them, and next to treat them with fairness.

But there is a very close affinity between the way in which Roman Catholic Priests quote and refer to the Bible to prove their mummeries, and the way in which professed infidels mangle and misrepresent the Book which they seek to disparage.

Our readers may judge, from the following specimen :—

RELIGION IN REFERENCE TO RUSH AND THE MANNINGS.

WE have spoken generally of the antagonism which should be always on the alert to resist the prejudices of the public. Not less wanting is a journal to mark the progress (which every day affords) to a sounder state of opinion, upon things divested of religious interference. It would be an ample task, and a pleasant one, to note the admissions in our favour made in the public transactions in the newspapers, in the polemical literature of the religious, and in the passing works of the day intended for general reading. We may also mention how necessary it is to have a journal to rebut the charges against infidels. It is an old invention of the enemy to attribute infidelity to the criminals of society, or, reversely, to ascribe all crimes to infidelity. It requires a *MORAL diagnosis of the facts, to show that crimes are rather to be referred to religion, than attributable to the want of it.* The past year has afforded two remarkable criminal cases—Rush and the Mannings. Rush was *shown* to be a reli-

gious man ; family prayers were *offered* up morning and evening, *collections* were raised for religious purposes ; *EVEN during the trial* he would have drawn inferences from the Bible, in defence of himself. He *was religious* : his idea of religion, his reading the Bible, his knowledge of a God and of a future state of rewards and punishments, *did not deter HIM* from committing murder ; and *with religion in HIS MOUTH* to the last, he suffered the penalty of the law, attesting his innocence as he paid the forfeiture of his notorious guilt. *None* of the public *COULD* well assert that Rush's crime arose from *want of religion*, therefore it was not attempted ; but there was no attempt to show that he belonged to the *ranks of the religious*, and *how impotent were prayers offered up to Providence*, "to lead us not into temptation, and to deliver us from evil ;" how impotent was the reading of the Bible to prevent the crime. *Religion and the Bible seem always convertible into crime* : therein the criminal *has a motive to commit crime*, which the *infidel* is indeed without. "Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord," and there are innumerable instances of his execution of it in the Bible, through the medium of his chosen people. To revenge himself on the Jermy's was one motive which actuated Rush, and he found a justification of it in the Scriptures. The other inducement was the love of gain, and it would be easy to show that plunder and murder went generally together, and were the joint purpose of the Almighty of THE OLD Testament, and of his people, Israel.

Religion was at least *a principle* in Manning's mind ; it was shown in evidence to have been brought out *frequently to combat the premeditation of the murder*, and we must suppose that *Manning's THEOLOGY* finally *adapted itself* to murder. *Religion* to prevent crime, religion to produce repentance, or religion as law, justice or punishment, sure to fall on the offender, in apprehension of hereafter if not in reality here—*seemed EQUALLY inefficacious* on the Mannings. Manning, who was *devout*, endeavoured to show the persuasion to crime was in the materialism of his wife. He said his wife had used the language of Solomon, that the body was but as other earth, and did not rise again. However, the chaplain's attention was drawn to it, who said that Mrs. Manning had not given any sign of such opinion, and her *orthodoxy* appeared very satisfactory to him. Therefore the charge of *infidelity*, as the cause of the crime was arrested in the bud. Very likely, in his *theological* disquisitions previous to the crime, Manning may have discussed this with himself, or with *the surgeon*, whether he could go to heaven if there were a future state. Did the more impressionable religious state of the man make him preferable to the woman ? The feeling of the public was, if we may argue from the *Times* leader, more against the man than the woman. There was aiding and abetting in every step towards the consummation of the crime, with an evident endeavour to reconcile it with his religious scruples, as well as with the judicial consequences in this world. The public felt something of the contempt for Manning which his wife felt. She had courage, which he did not possess. There was a moral and matter-of-fact HYPOCRISY in Manning, which seems to be innate in many of the religious temperament. He appeared to be against, and he would go with, his wife in preparing the murder ; he would do a

little, or BY HALVES, not enough, as he thought to constitute a murderer. *Probably* religion, as we have said in the case of Rush, so in the case of the man Manning, *may have justified*, in HIS course of thought, the murder of O'Conner. O'Conner was an adulterer, *adjudged to death?* in the Bible, and a person, as Mrs. Manning reasoned, who had done them an ill turn, and Manning did not like him. It is not we only who say religion is so *easily convertible into crime*—*Shakspeare* holds the same opinion. *It cannot be said that Mrs. Manning was at all influenced by the existence, or non-existence, of religious belief*; it was NIL in her mind: family prayer and going to church, fashionable in good society, as the *Times* says, made no impression upon Mrs. Manning, a lady's maid of the aristocracy. WE therefore! are exonerated from Mrs. Manning, and we *give* the complete credit of Manning to the religious world.

In reply to this wild imagination, we may suggest some of those reflections and difficulties which will occur to an infidel who understands the question. He might reason as follows:—

According to this, if there be any religious men who do not commit crimes; they are hypocrites; for “religion and crime are convertible;” it is the weakness of the religious public, which calls a man hypocrite, who whilst making profession of religion, does some disgraceful action: for *we* see, that this is the only consistent profession. Undoubtedly the Churches are in a very low state of spirituality, but the religious leaders have not hit on the true cause; they are always complaining, that their flocks do not live up to their privileges; and this is very plain, for whilst “crime and religion are convertible,” there is very little crime amongst professors, as compared with others, especially the swell mob. Policemen may have to attend theatres and free and easies, but the regular worshippers at chapels, forget their true vocation, which is to prepare for a swing.

There was *one* consistent quaker about two years ago, but the Society of Friends must confess it is an exception and not the rule. How seldom do we hear of a member of an Independent or Baptist Church, coming under the hand of Jack Ketch! Truly then religion is at a low ebb, and it is time the Churches were stirred up to a consistent walk and conversation. So notoriously is the public gulled upon this subject, that if a man wants to pass off as particularly honest, he never thinks of setting up for a stout blasphemer, but takes to family prayer! Surely there is something rotten in the State of Denmark; since what is convertible with crime, is a cloak to hide criminal intentions.

Yet it cannot be doubted, that the Bible teaches the doctrine of murder, for it says thou shalt not kill; and introduces Cain as an example to all believers.

“In this is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should hate one another: like Cain who was of that Holy one, and slew his brother.”—(1 John iii. 12.) (See also Gen. iv. 9—12.)—“And the Lord said unto Cain, where *is* Abel thy brother? and he said I know not: *Am* I my brother's keeper. When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth.” (Gen. ix. 6. Exodus xx. 13.)

And we are plainly taught that vengeance is *ours*, because “Vengeance

is *MINE* I will repay saith the Lord :—" therefore if thine enemy hunger, starve him; if he thirst give him no drink." " Dearly beloved avenge yourselves."

The reader is requested not to examine Rom. 12—19—21, or he may imagine the Bible teaches the opposite doctrine: and that when Jehovah says vengeance is *mine*, he means that it is *not* ours, and therefore commands us " NOT to avenge ourselves."

In this way these murderers would find no motives to help their criminality, by reading the Bible. But we Reasoners, like Priests, be-take ourselves to non-natural senses, and read the Bible backwards, rather than allow it to escape. " It requires a moral diagnosis of the facts, to shew that crimes are to be referred to religion:" we must first confound the Old Testament with the New; regard God's providential and judicial acts *in driving out the Canaanites for their wickedness*, as patterns for private murder, because vengeance belongeth only unto God: we must first mistake Judaism and try Christians by this mistake: we must carefully overlook the New Testament arguments, that we are told to be " kind to one another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you. Be ye therefore followers of God as dear children; And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us."—(Eph. iv. 32. v. 1, 2.)

How natural it was for Rush and the Mannings to find arguments from this source. " Probably religion in *their course* of thought may have justified the murders." O'Connor had done the Mannings " an ill turn," therefore the Bible justified their revenge.

It is true the following passages seem to make against the doctrine; but a true reasoner will look to Old Testament wars, not to New Testament principles. " We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not *his* brother abideth in death. My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth.—(1 John iii. 14—18.)

Christians may perhaps pretend that Jesus Christ is their example, and that infidels should find revenge and murder in him. No doubt this would be a difficult task, as his last act was to forgive his murderers; but we can easily manage to omit these objectionable points.

V.

The Nature of Man as Spiritual, Immortal, and Responsible, will be the most frequent topic of this department: though sometimes we shall introduce MISCELLANEOUS Subjects.

POETIC DICTION.—ITS USE AND ABUSE BY THE ORATORS.*

SPEECH, the vehicle of thought, next to reason of which it is the instrument, is the noblest gift of heaven. There are various degrees in the facility of speaking, from the stammering of untaught men, to the ease of conversation, and the eloquence of public orators. And though language is the common possession of mankind, in many it exists rather as a latent capacity than as a matured power; but wherever it has been carried to an extraordinary degree of perfection, it has gained the admiration of all. Homer, though delighting in the sterner scenes of warfare and bloodshed, describes with congenial admiration "the sweet speaking Nestor, the shrill orator of the Pylians, from whose tongue language flowed sweeter than honey." Nor do any of this author's heroes appear more noble, with all their valour, than the "discreet Ulysses" by his eloquence.

Whether speech itself, or merely the capacity of acquiring it, was the original endowment of mankind, would be too wide a subject for discussion here; but that it is the chief source of amelioration cannot be doubted. Nor have we any difficulty in sympathizing with the poet, when, considering this high distinction of human nature, he celebrates "eloquent Mercury, the grandson of Atlas, the messenger of great Jove, and of the gods, who shaped the fierce manners of newly-formed men by the faculty of speech." (Horace, lib. i. carmen x.) But not only was he thus the messenger of the *gods*; he was, if we may continue the pagan metaphor, also the messenger of *men*; both by conveying from one to another what was godlike within them; and by carrying up to the gods the gratitude and worship of mankind.

There is a great variety in the styles of speech cultivated by men; but the most obvious distinction is into prose and poetry. Yet even these

* We reluctantly postpone a contribution promised last month,—a criticism on previous articles,—lest we should give our readers over much logic at one time. And have chosen rather to give a little rhetoric. This article on Poetic Diction, from the pen of a writer to the "Bible and the People," originally appeared in the *Biblical Review*. The cessation of that Review, together with the peculiar class of readers amongst whom it circulated, leads us to republish the article, as being both interesting to persons in general, and especially useful to students for the ministry, and aspirants to public speaking, amongst our intelligent working men, for whom our labours are intended.

are not so clearly marked as to be easily distinguished; they also slide into each other; and the difference can be clearly seen only when we look far away from the narrow boundary which separates them.

We shall not attempt a strict definition; only a description can be ventured of things that differ chiefly in degree. Poetry is essentially elevating: it adorns fact: its portraits are more brilliant than the originals: it is genius giving its own hues to nature. Carlyle calls poetry "musical thought; the idea is, no doubt, pretty, but not very tangible; and yet, perhaps, on this very account, it is the more suitable as a description of poetry. Whether poetry consists in the idea, or in the form of the expression, it is not very easy to determine; perhaps it is chiefly in the conception; but this naturally leads to a corresponding style of language called "poetic diction." To a great extent, this kind of diction involves poetical conceptions, not as whole pieces of art, but as tints and shades; since every particular word is a heightening of the idea connected with the object which the word denotes. Hence we regard poetic imagery generally as involved in the employment of poetic language; and so we shall treat of them as convertible.

Most languages have sets of words peculiarly adapted to poetry, and other words suited to prose; the former glance at things in a secondary light, and regard them under some more elevated view than they at first present; the latter denote things as they are supposed to be in reality; or as they obviously appear. The language of poetry is less familiar; prose deals in "household words," it is the undress of every-day life. There is also an obvious mechanical difference in their framework, or general structure; poetry being distinguished by a peculiar metrical regularity; yet, doubtless, there is some sort of measure even in prose, though not so distinct and formal. Poetry then, by way of a loose definition, may be called, elevated conceptions expressed in appropriate language, and subject to a definite measure. By elevated conceptions we do not mean *absolutely lofty*, but lifted above the common and obvious conception of the things described. So far, then, as prose possesses these characteristics, it partakes of the nature of poetry. There is a roundness, majesty, and fulness of sound, in the general style of poetic prose; it is not an easy shambling walk; but a soldier-like march. Yet, as we have said, poetry and prose slide into each other; but the latter is for matters of fact and the business of life; the former is more adapted to retired leisure. Poetry has an ideal world transcending the real one; a bower of grace and loveliness in which we sit luxuriantly, contemplating nature as a universal Eden. But even in actual business the vehemence and loftiness of passion sometimes lift us into the region of poetry; hence the mixing up of poetry and prose, and the origin of this present discussion. Poetry is of two kinds, of the intellect and of the heart; of the imagination and of the affections; based on brilliant ideas, or on vivid feelings; imaginative and pathetic. The merely imaginative is, for the most part, misplaced in oratory; it is false taste; it is playing with conceits and puns, instead of going right on with the business in hand. The imaginative, whose end is simply ornament, is exclusively adapted to professed poetry, as in descriptive pieces. Both intellectual poetry, and the diction proper to it, want pathos; it is clear, but cold; it has light

but no warmth, and hence is unsuitable to true oratory. Shelley is the best specimen of it; in his larger pieces he has it to excess, even for poetry. His lambent flame plays about the head, but does not kindle in the heart; it sheds forth clear cold moonbeams on some frosty night. His radiance is not summer sunshine; he has brilliancy without glow. He has built for us a *glittering ice-palace*.

This sort of poetry, and the diction expressive of it, and partaking of its character, are therefore unsuited to eloquence. Its coldness is an objection to it, and it is ill-adapted for oratory, because it is artificial. In general its beauty is forced; the flowers it cultivates are sickly exotics. True genius has a home satisfaction that can dispense with what is extrinsic. Truth will not be bedecked; it demands an acknowledgment that right and truth are ornament and dignity. It is further ineffective, as it aims not at the true object of oratory, conviction and persuasion; but rests in itself. The means become the end. Poetical diction, in so far as it adorns the *style*, is false eloquence; but in so far as it adorns the *subject*, it is appropriate. To leave an impression that one has spoken eloquently on liberty, is beside the mark; but to leave on the minds of the auditory an enthusiastic admiration of liberty as the true greatness of civil life, is to accomplish a legitimate end. The diction of the orator is a picture, that seeks not admiration of itself but love for the original. Hence the style should be so transparent as to throw a clear light on the subject; not to dazzle by its own prismatic hues. It is a window we are to see through, not stained glass we are to look at. An oration should leave men filled with the subject, not with itself; whatever diminishes the unity of this effect stands in the way of the orator's proper end. But all ornaments for mere beauty are there simply for their own sake; whereas nothing should be introduced but what an interest in the subject excites, which will never be the superficial beauty of a fanciful poetry, but the poetry of the heart.

There are, moreover, certain laws of mind which a profusion of this kind of imagery directly violates. Argument and persuasion appeal to human nature, and should therefore conform to it. This false taste violates, first, that law of mind in accordance with which impressions diminish on frequent repetition. Whatever is glaring strikes most at first, but the eye gets used to it, and tired of it. So does the mind become familiar with florid eloquence: it has seen the lightning and heard the thunder too often to be terrified; all is now blank cartridge, or a mere flash in the pan. Uniform poetic brilliancy by this means becomes flat prose.

The second law of mind which this false oratory violates is that which requires a conception to aid and preserve an impression. If the intellect be not employed, the enjoyment of the senses flags; the melody of sweet sounds may possibly give a kind of physical pleasure; but there must be some association or idea connected with it, or the ear is soon palled; the music must remind us of old scenes or old friends, or be associated with present festive joy, and set fancy afloat on the wings of melody, or it must be "married to immortal verse," and become itself more ravishing, whilst it deepens the sentiments of the poet. A bold outline of natural scenery may, at first, impress us with wonder and admiration; but to

continue these feelings we must see the scene alive with the busy actors of a bygone age; their departed spirits must revisit the scenes of their mortal life; they must walk abroad and give interest to the place; it will thus stand to us as the index of ancient times. Thus we want an idea to continue and deepen an impression. They feel most interest in a thing, who know most about it. If we have nothing to think about, we cannot feel long or deeply, whatever we may have to listen to or stare at. The eye and the ear soon get tired if the mind is not interested. The same principle is applicable to oratory; poetical imagery must not take the place of clear ideas, of really instructive and interesting thoughts. There can be no conviction nor passion without a conception; we must have the key to the understanding to find the way into the heart. If we would nurse wrath, we must think of injuries received or intended; if we would excite pity, we must give a conception of distress. Poetical imagery sometimes heightens these representations, but it must not be of that kind which dazzles by its own beauty.

The third law of mind which a profusion of poetic imagery violates, is, that the mind naturally reposes in what is ordinary. A style habitually florid seeks to keep the mind on the stretch; whereas "Apollo sometimes wakes with his harp the silent muse, nor *always* bends his bow." The mind is not like the troubled sea; its waves must sometimes subside; its natural condition is a calm: it must only occasionally be lashed and agitated. Nor is this principle less true of the feelings connected with admiration than of our more turbulent passions. Inordinately continued finery is, therefore, sure to outrun our sympathies: our minds are but moderately provided with explosive mixtures; we have but a small surplus of feeling and admiration to throw away: if the mendicant be too obstreperous and insolent in his demands, we refuse him that which we may occasionally afford to modest worth. This palpable effort to carry our wonder by storm, leads us to fortify our castle, and close the gates against such an unwelcome intruder. We can entertain a begging minstrel on a Christmas or a new year's day, but must not be dinned with a fiddle or bagpipe, nor yet with tales and songs, the whole year round. There is a time for everything: our staple duties and joys are household. If our enjoyments aim at perpetual elevation and ecstasy, even luxuries turn into necessities; and because what is extraordinary cannot lift us to itself, it comes down to our level, and itself becomes ordinary, so that this excessive labour and over refinement is thrown away. True oratory, therefore will be plain, homely, and masculine—in other words, natural; stooping generally to the actual walks of life, and only occasionally refreshing us with a flight upwards.

Having thus considered the defects of a too ornate or florid oratory, namely, that it is cold, artificial, and distracting; and having shown that it violates several laws of that very mind which it appeals to; we shall next inquire, wherein adorned language, or poetic diction, is appropriate and useful. In the first place, ornament in general should be subordinate. The chief characteristics of true oratory, are clearness and force; the one to give ideas, the other to urge to a course of action consistent with those ideas. So far as ornament aids in this, it is to be admitted: but it must come of itself; for, if it be laboured after, it will be seen to be the

end. Beauty and force appear in many cases to be incompatible. Yet this is only in appearance, for though beauty, when excessive, weakens, it may, nevertheless, be so distributed as to increase energy. Plumes add to the dignity of armies—their waving standards and glittering equipments are imposing; but the “pomp and circumstance of glorious war,” must also be associated with strength of muscle and of heart. When *show* is at the expense of *power*, it more naturally awakens contempt than admiration, whilst, on the contrary, when that which is graceful is grafted on that which is powerful, it becomes almost sublime, by the terrible energy with which it is allied. The very mention of the ornaments suggests the force which they serve only to adorn. The application of this to oratory is obvious; the basis of style must be force; the surface may be adorned, and then the beauty and the power will be reciprocally heightened. There must be the rock, well bedded in the earth, and then on this substratum we may scatter the light soil to cultivate flowers and arbours, amidst the frowning fortresses which that rock supports. In oratory, then, strength is the main quality, beauty is subordinate. In proper proportion beauty adds to power, but in excess it weakens.

Poetic diction is useful in oratory, so far as it renders the ideas conveyed more vivid in colouring, and clearer in outline; for the end of oratory is generally persuasion through the medium of conviction, and the power upon the will depends upon the influence exerted over the intellect. Men are more readily prompted to revenge by seeing injustice clearly pointed out and warmly painted: poetry is painting—it both draws the outline and adds the tints; and the orator requires both, that in taking hold of the imagination and reason he may insure a mastery over the affections. He must, therefore, paint so glowingly, that to see will be to feel. All impression depends on thought, and will be proportioned to the clearness and vividness of the thought. Yet even here it is needful, by way of caution, to remark, that there are two ways of heightening a description, namely, either by poetical painting, or by minute and literal enumeration of some indicative circumstances, as in the contest between the Tergemini, (Livy, 1st book, chap. xxv.,) in which the reader sees the battle as if he were there, is as breathless as the spectators were, and almost hears or feels the oppressive silence of the two parties looking on. This method of indirect description is appropriate to masculine eloquence, giving a bold likeness at one stroke; but the poetic method is occasionally admirable, and when employed at a point of great interest is lofty and overpowering.

We proceed, then, briefly to apply these considerations to the oratory of ancient and modern times.

And first, as to ancient oratory, that is, Grecian and Roman. Demosthenes and Cicero as much excel all other orators, as they themselves fall short of the perfect idea of their art. Yet there was a wide difference between them: whatever poetry Demosthenes had did not exist for its own sake, but arose from necessity, from the vehemence of his feelings. Cicero often transplanted his flowers to his oration; they had plainly not grown there: and herein is the distinction between the florid and the masculine, the fine and the true; the natural cultivates whole forests, the

artificial introduces small exotic beauties; the one is the native growth of the soil, the other is a drooping sickly flower, or a stunted tree that stands in an ungenial clime.

But whilst Cicero had a great deal of the false poetic—was too painted and garish, there was also much native genius and force, which, if less encumbered with ornament, would have rendered his name still more illustrious.

He best exemplified his own description of eloquence, "*est copiose loquens sapientia*;" but he erred as to the copiousness. Demosthenes emits in two electric flashes what Cicero describes in successive flowing sentences. Hume's enumeration of the characteristic features of his eloquence has been eulogised as the happiest criticism on that celebrated orator. "It is," says Hume, "rapid harmony, exactly adjusted to the sense; it is vehement reasoning without any appearance of art; it is disdain, anger, boldness, freedom, involved in a continuous stream of argument."

The truest criterion of his oratory is that his power is unquestioned: no one pretends to be his rival, nor to find another that can match him. He is natural, and, therefore, appeals to all men. He stands alone in the universality of the admiration he has acquired. His style is that of argumentative feeling: it is the logic of the heart: his ornaments are not there for their own sake, they are not put in nor sought for, but present themselves: his vehemence was that of a noble steed, striking sparks from his hoofs, in his rapid course.

His orations are instances of unity; his force is one, his energies were combined, concentrated on the main point: he was not to be diverted, and would not divert his hearers; his force lay in reiterated impression—a tension toward one definite end; he meant something by every word he said; his beauty and force are not in the parts, but in the consentaneous whole. Every bound led towards the "mark;" he had few prominences; his most vehement apostrophes (as swearing by the ghost of those who perished at Marathon and Platae) were not over-precipitous; he reached his elevations by gradual ascents,—by easy and natural stages, he came to the climax of boldness and sublimity.

The power of Demosthenes, like all terrific and sublime agencies, is seen only by its effects; but Cicero made a display of his art. In his defence of Milo you would think him as anxious about his own reputation as about the life of his friend. Yet, in general, though his diction is too ornamental, his boldest strokes are moderately well sustained by the style preceding: his apostrophe on the crucifixion of a Roman citizen is generally referred to as a fair specimen of his lofty vehemence both in thought and diction: so palpable was the outrage, that desolate solitudes, rocks and mountains, would become his sympathetic and indignant audience. But he sometimes outruns the sympathy of the severe critic, and his efforts at the sublime degenerate into the ridiculous, as when he invests the walls of the Senate-house with gratitude. In general his style was too ambitious; the means became the end; he was like a warrior whose glittering sword is muffled in the folds of his flowing dress. Real passion is self-absorbed, but he did not so much seem lost in his own feelings as determined to make others feel.

Æschines, though far inferior to his rival Demosthenes, was nevertheless an orator of great power, yet, in some instances, he left the real pathetic for forced eloquence, as in the exclamation, "O earth, O sun, bravery, intellect, and education!" This is not true poetry, nor passion, but plain rant; it is too sudden; the preceding sentences do not naturally lead to it; it is like a drunken man in sober company.

Demosthenes was as plain in his diction, as manly in his thoughts; he talked of business in the style of business; he was too intent to be nice; he dared to be plain and pungent, nay, even what "waiting gentlewomen" would call vulgar: as when he described the too late shifting and dodging of the unskilful boxer putting forth his hand to ward off a blow he has already received.

Cicero might, perhaps, exceed him in the number of splendid passages, (a criterion with the majority,) but this standard is founded on false taste. The true force of an oration does not consist in a few ornate sentences, or an occasional lavishness of splendid imagery; but in the general arrangement, bearing upon one point; which arrangement gives its cumulative force to an apparently irregular outburst; just like the point of the wedge in military tactics, where the force of this projecting front depends on the concentration of power from behind.

It may, perhaps be thought by some, that after all, oratory is a mere matter of taste—that its excellencies are wholly relative. And no doubt this is true to a great extent. What one regards as florid, another looks upon as chaste. Cicero would excite the laughter of a cultivated English audience, by those very passages which would call forth the lively admiration of our Gallic neighbours. But whilst we admit that, to a certain extent, eloquence is relative, and that he is the best orator who "carries his point," it should also be remembered, that this is applicable chiefly, if not solely, to artificial eloquence, that is, the ornate or florid style. And the reason of this is obvious. The degree of men's refinement (to which, for the most part, this style addresses itself) is infinitely varied. But natural eloquence—plain honest sense—aided by the poetry of the affections,—warm, energetic feeling,—singleness of purpose, and loftiness of principle,—this genuine effusion of a noble soul prevails alike with the rude and the refined; because it appeals to the elements common to both. At the same time it is confessed that this manly eloquence does not gain equal admiration to itself. Many would call the other "finer," and praise it accordingly. They are right about the finery, but wrong about the praise. The admiration which a florid style gains to itself is its chief defect. The fact that the plainly argumentative and pathetic does not acquire this admiration, is both the highest tribute to this method of speaking, and the true secret of its success. Whilst men exclaim rapturously about the beauty of the one, they proceed quietly to obey the other.

And this is why Demosthenes stands so much above the crowd of lesser orators, and why Cicero, the distant second to Demosthenes, sometimes goes beyond the sympathy of the judicious; and also why his occasional puerilities gain excessive admiration from those whose taste is less cultivated and severe. He himself lost sympathy with some of his earlier productions, as not being "*aptæ rebus agendis*;" not suited to the

business of life. In short, florid or ornate eloquence is relative, that is, it pleases some extravagantly, and disgusts others as much; but true eloquence is absolute, that is, it captivates all; or, rather, it sways all; for it captivates very few. This reasoning applies not only to general poetic conceptions, or a florid style of thought, but equally to the most confined sense of the phrase, "poetic diction;" since what is false of the deeper process, is equally false of the more superficial one; and, in general, this style of thought and language not only agree, the false in the one being accompanied by the false in the other, but they are objectionable on the same grounds; nor are they easily distinguishable by strict definition.

In glancing at the oratory of the ancients, we ought not to overlook the influence of the Sophists. These professional rhetoricians, ranting on every subject, and on every side of it, assisted greatly in corrupting eloquence. Having no real interest in any actual cause, they turned to dazzling and word-play. From this arose the false taste they cultivated in themselves, and gave rise to in others. They employed themselves about brilliant paradoxes and common topics; engaged in the light skirmish of wit, or rather of evasion—a sort of review-battle, which turned all true, warlike speech into an effeminate equipment. This poetical oratory was suited to their idle kind of life; but was not suited to their pretensions of teaching those who had to engage in real business.

Whenever the occupation of men is trivial, and they have no real interest in the business of life, they are inclined to form some artificial pursuit. The emptiness of these men, seeking a relief in an instrumental art, turned it into an end, and made rhetoric the art of dazzling; just as the schoolmen, by concentrating their thoughts on distinctions and definitions, instead of on things to be distinguished and defined, turned to quibbles and hair-splitting. If men are idle, they must invent some game, to give them at least an artificial interest in existence. The Sophists played at words; they tricked out their topics of spare teaching. But life is not a sport; and therefore that eloquence which is suited to life will be as earnest, and as far from affected ornament, as life itself is.

The power of what is natural is confessed by all. The very persons who admire a florid speech feel that there is some deficiency or unsoundness, though they cannot detect it; but when a Demosthenes steps in, and presents to them that which measures the height and depth of their feeling, he is at once recognised; for men perceive that he is intent on the question; hurried, eager, and determined, fired with true zeal, and bent on inspiring others with the same. Now and then he comes up to some scene of beauty, but gives it scarcely a glance; it is beneath his lofty purpose. They have not come here to dally with sweetness; time presses, life is serious; a journey lies before them; they must turn aside from these wild flowers, to the desolate grandeur of that wilderness through which they have yet to travel.

We proposed to apply the general principles laid down in this essay, in the second place, to oratory as exemplified by the moderns.

The eloquence of modern times is, perhaps more logical, (confining this term strictly to the intellect,) but certainly it is less vehement. This tameness may result partly from the altered character of those who are to be addressed, and who, from the general prevalence of knowledge and

reflective habits, are less liable to be carried away by feeling; and no doubt it results partly from the absence of great oratorical power; for this could enkindle cold natures with the same "potent art" with which it vivifies all inanimate things.

Amongst English orators, Fox and Brougham approach nearest to the characteristics of Demosthenes; Burke is of Cicero's school. He had an equal, if not superior profusion of imagery, and copiousness of diction, but was also more extravagant. His genius, like his style, was too multiform and splendid for the highest success in oratory: he wanted severity; and the want of this allowed him to bring into play the wrong qualities for the occasion. He theorized like a philosopher, and painted gaudily like a poet, when he should have repressed these characteristics, and have allowed his enthusiasm to dash along under the curb of a severe and manly taste. Instead of this earnest simplicity, he was lost beneath his armour; vast stores of knowledge and facility of combination buried the orator—as the Roman virgin was crushed beneath the shields of those Sabines whom she admitted within the walls of the infant city.

But let us do justice to the oratory of this illustrious man. He could be equal to a great occasion; and when his passions, instead of his gorgeous fancy, were in exercise, he had no common powers of lofty declamation. His proudest triumph was at Westminster Hall, on the impeachment of Warren Hastings. The occasion itself was one of intense interest. It was the English nation, in the person of Edmund Burke, pleading, before the highest tribunal, the cause of suffering India. He was equal to the occasion; there could not be greater praise: his peroration is unrivalled in dignity and energy.

And perhaps the infrequency of such stimulating occasions accounts for the tameness and false glare of modern oratory. It was a question of national interest. England went to listen to that brilliant array of genius, as really as ever Greece listened to Demosthenes. Perhaps there were more contemporaneous orators in England then, than at any other time, before or since. Besides those engaged in this impeachment—Burke, Fox, and Sheridan—there were many others of illustrious names; as Wyndham, Pitt, and Erskine. Mr. Erskine, no mean judge, as he was no mean orator, describes the power displayed in this grand cause, as "shaking the walls that surrounded them with the anathemas of superhuman eloquence."

We should be extending our observations to a disproportionate and tedious length, though it is a tempting theme, were we to enter upon a discussion of the oratory of Brougham, the first of our English orators. That he is a critic also is evident, not only from his dissertation on the Eloquence of the Ancients, but also from the speech delivered by him on entering upon the rectorship of Glasgow University; in which address he explains and exemplifies his own peculiar excellences.

Modern eloquence might be discussed under four heads: the pulpit, the bar, the legislature, and popular assemblies. We shall conclude by noticing briefly only the pulpit.

Simplicity of diction, dignity of thought, earnestness of feeling, are above all required here; in no other place are prettinesses so impertinent. The style for the pulpit must be plain to all, without being offensive to

any; it requires homeliness without vulgarity, earnestness without fanaticism. It must be the natural expression of a man who feels an affectionate interest in his audience, and who is conveying to them, with earnest persuasion, great truths, in which they have a momentous interest. How happens it, then, that on such subjects men either drivel along with cold common-places, or carry bulky tomes of commentators into the pulpit, or indulge in deep metaphysical disquisitions, or, seeking to captivate admiration, bedizen their style with meretricious finery? The chief reason is, that the reality and importance of religious truth are very inadequately felt; not so much from hypocrisy, either in its teachers or professors, as from the indistinct manner in which these truths are apprehended. What is present and palpable pre-occupies men's attention; spiritual things are generally regarded as remote, and certainly are impalpable; and hence the great danger of their being undervalued.

A law-pleading, on the paltriest occasion, excites more interest than pleading with men about their own future destiny; chiefly because it is future; and because the other is felt to be a present tangible interest. And yet the duties of religion are as pressing, and the pleasures of religion are as real and immediate, and the object of religion is as much present, as any worldly duty or interest whatsoever.

But to put faith in the place of sense, is a most difficult task; requiring not only the clearness and earnestness of the speaker, but the power of the truths he enforces, and the gracious agencies by which those truths are accompanied.

How, then, are men to become imbued with a conviction of the nearness and reality of these objects? Plainly by enforcing the great doctrines of the Bible, the intimate, though invisible, presence of Jehovah, as a Father and Judge; the claims of his mercy; the happiness of serving him; or, as a last resort, the madness and infatuation of bidding defiance to Omnipotence! The more deeply the preacher feels these things, the more forcibly will he express them; the great secret therefore, of sound pulpit oratory is to cherish an honest, hearty conviction of the truths of religion, and a conscientious discharge of its duties; together with a benevolent consciousness that the same truths and feelings are important for others. With these convictions, the preacher's style will be agonistic, or wrestling; and, like a wrestler, he will lay aside all encumbering ornament, and seek to gain the day, not by pleasing some spectators with his appearance, but by overthrowing his antagonist.

The best illustration of this plain vehemence is afforded by South's sermon's. He is homely, bold, sarcastic, and indignant; but lacks the "milk of human kindness." The same energy, insight, and boldness, tempered by affection, and turned to nobler ends than South too often aimed at, would constitute a perfect Christian orator. But South was not only an orator—an example of severe and manly eloquence—he was a critic, as well as a standard; and has left strictures and criticisms which exemplify his own excellences.

From the text, "For I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist," (Luke xxi. 15,) he takes occasion to mention the true elements of pulpit oratory, condemning floridness of style, and giving illustrations of it, which glance (by

no means obliquely) at Jeremy Taylor. But the one who ranks next to South, in adaptation to the present age, is Richard Baxter, that is, as a preacher, or in his practical works—especially in his “Reformed Pastor.” Taking all the requisites of a minister, Baxter is of course infinitely superior to South; nor does he fall far behind in force of thought, which is the true basis of a forcible style.

South preached to confound the Puritans, Baxter to save souls. South breathed an eternal Phillipic against the Roundheads; his sermons were Cromwellics, intended to throw odium on that “beggarly bankrupt fellow,” and his “fanatic” associates.

If South was the Demosthenes of the pulpit, Jeremy Taylor was its Cicero; though, of course, inferior to that speaker, and more frequently violating the principles of a severe taste. It is the mistake of many to suppose that finery is force; and also that what is called a popular preacher must, of necessity, be an effective one. But it is plain that the best preacher is he who makes the *truth popular*, and who is willing to become subordinate to his cause; they who are not, serve not Jesus Christ, but themselves. The pulpit admits of more lofty vehemence, and less of mere ornaments, both of pretty thoughts and words, than any other scene of oratory.

The preacher who palpably violates taste, violates also a great trust. If he aim to shine, he not only mistakes the nature of rhetoric, but the duty of his calling.

The style of the pulpit should accord with the general scheme and character of the Gospel; “we seek Divine simplicity in him, who handles things Divine.”

The Bible is one great standard for pulpit oratory; not in the general vehemence, but in the dignity and chasteness of its style. It abounds in prose, poetry, and picture language; as in the Prophecies, Psalms, and Apocalypse. And what can rival in poetic beauty the parables of our Lord?—exquisite gems of the severest taste, and kindest affection; with nothing tawdry, colouring merely the expression; but all the warmth and beauty being thrown on to the subject; quiet, modest, and lovely, excelling all other pictures, as the pearl of great price exceeds all others in lustre and value.

If simplicity is the highest excellence of speech on general subjects, much more is it befitting the momentous subjects of religion. If it appear an unworthy vanity for an orator, on an ordinary subject, to blow the trumpet in proclamation of his own brilliant genius, it is a more serious responsibility that is incurred when the preacher puts himself in the place of his subject, and, while speaking to men about their duties to the eternal God, thrusts himself between the creature and the proper object of the creature’s adoration.

But in conclusion, whilst we repudiate finery for its own sake, prettinesses, either of fancy or expression, we are no advocates for tameness, that “waterishness” that strikes no one; we plead for a bold, manly, and severe eloquence, the dignity of which shall arise from feeling, not from fancy.

True passion is of its own nature elevating and poetical; this poetry and elevation is the only ornament which nature admits of. But the eleva-

tions of true passion are not like mounds raised round a retired villa, they are the mighty upheavings of nature, by which the very strata of rocks are disarranged, and protuded upwards.

True oratory will itself be dumb, whilst it transfers its own passions to external nature, making the "stones of Rome to rise and mutiny," or the sun to hide himself from the enormities it would pourtray, by covering it with darkness. It places Jupiter on Olympus, and invests him with the avenging thunder; it transforms the universe into one mighty hall of justice, and calls upon the Supreme Judge to defend the right. It warms in its progress, and pours forth, in fit words, the kindlings of its lofty genius: all nature is plastic beneath its power; every range of knowledge presents obedient messengers swift to do its bidding: like some Divinity, it makes the elements its vassals; and, too dignified to be seen itself, effects all by secondary agencies: it points not to itself; you scarcely hear its voice; the great subjects it deals in speak with you face to face. May this noble art flourish; contribute to the true dignity of national character; banish all effeminacy of speech and principle; and, nurtured by all the good, may it serve to advance the great interests of freedom, morality, and religion.

B. G.

REVIEWS AND CRITICISMS.

NOTICES OF "THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE."

It will be interesting to many of our readers, as it is encouraging to ourselves, to know that our labours so far have been kindly received, and appreciated. Besides many personal assurances by letter of the satisfaction given, and the usefulness commencing amongst the classes aimed at, we have been favoured with the following (condensed) notices from contemporaries.

And we give these to encourage our friends in their generous efforts, especially commending to them the suggestion contained in the *British Examiner* and *Bath Record*, viz. that "Christians may do good service to the souls of men, by placing THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE in the hands of the doubting or unbelieving."

The following are Extracts from Reviews of No. I.

"The department (of labour here undertaken) is, we believe, unoccupied, and is one in which great service may be done. The first number contains much food for thought, and acute clever writing. We shall be glad to find the Editor's boldness and energy appropriately rewarded."—*Nonconformist*.

"The first number is varied in its contents, sound in its principles, and healthy in its tone. The article on 'Christianity,' &c., will confirm waverers, and stir up those who have been asleep. 'The Keys of the Kingdom' is cleverly written. 'Free Thoughts to Free-Thinkers; for the great body of the working classes, these 'Thoughts,' clearly expressed in plain terms, addressed to their reason and experience, are peculiarly valuable. 'The Bible and the People' commences auspiciously."—*Birmingham Journal*.

"We cordially recommend it to all classes of readers. The popular forms of Infidelity are here met in a bolder and better way than we have seen in any periodical. There is no mistake about the heartiness and ability with which the Editor advocates his views. Persons must be stronger for his vigorous articles. This fearless writer is a fair representative of an increasing number of Christians.

"The paper on 'The Keys,' &c., is inimitable, both as a polemical piece and an exposition. 'The Bible and The People' is a cheap six-pennyworth."—*Hastings and St. Leonard's News*.

"In these times, when all principles are being sifted, and the minds of many are unsettled, especially in regard to the fundamentals of Christianity, such a popular publication as this is much needed; and on these grounds 'The Bible and The People' is calculated to make its way."

"'Priests' Religion,' is an able exhibition of the juggles of designing priests, and exposes with much force the pretensions of the Papacy to the exclusive possession of the Keys.

"'Sceptics' Religion' contains excellent arguments, and will be read with interest by the class for whom the articles are intended. The 'Infidel Press' is manfully grappled with. The work is calculated to lead the reader to think deeply on the most important subjects," &c.—*Birmingham Mercury*.

The following notice of No. 2, appeared in "The Nonconformist."

THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE has, under the head of "Christ's Religion," a very instructive and ingeniously written article on "The inscription on the Cross: its three Languages and their Lessons." "Peter's Keys and the Pope's Picklocks; or Binding and Loosing," is a keen exposure of the pretences involved in the Confessional, as well as an elucidation of a difficult passage. "The House of Merchandise" furnishes some edifying samples of the mode in which Patronage is bought and sold in the Establishment. Commenting on the act of the Saviour in clearing the temple, the writer says pithily and truly—

"No doubt our Lord was frequently set down as very *harsh* in his conduct, and *pre-eminently bitter in the spirit* exhibited in his *denunciations*. His words were such as cannot be equalled in severity of invective, when dealing with "Scribes and Pharisees, and hypocrites!" who for a pretence made long prayers and for a practice devoured widows' houses. He reserved his mildness and gentleness for publicans and sinners, men who made no pretensions, and confessed their sinfulness.

"This point in our Lord's character has yet to be made prominent, in its relation to our present public affairs; and to all reformation and abuses.

"*The grand argument of nearly all defenders of abuses, is to CONDEMN THE bitterness with which they are exposed: the point is invariably assumed,—that the reformer is of a bad spirit, and hence he is warned to consider "the meekness and gentleness of Christ."* They are never told to imitate Christ's *whip of small cords*; never to imitate his unsparing exposures, and powerful rebukes of *whited sepulchres; serpents, generations of vipers, children of the Devil!*

"This part of our Lord's spirit is ignored; and hence the smooth speaking now required, so contrary to the plain speaking of the gospel. Every expression condemnatory of existing evils, is by their abettors set down for a violation of Christian meekness; so charitable are they in enforcing charity. Men who love abuses become quite warm against the unchristian bitterness which reproves them."

There are two other papers—"The Atheist's Box; or the Argument of Design;" and "Mind and Matter; their Evidences and Distinctions." There is much suggestive matter throughout the number.

The Bristol Examiner and Bath Record reviewing Nos. I. and II. observes,—this new monthly magazine aims to be popular without being feeble; adapted to the unlearned readers, without coming down to the level of those who wish to be saved the trouble of thinking. It has begun well. We know not when we have met, in a periodical of the same class, with so much solid matter so clearly and vigorously expressed. We should rejoice to know that our young men, and intelligent mechanics especially, were extensively availing themselves of the helps here afforded to the right understanding of the great religious questions of the age. *It will now be their own fault if they do not become well grounded in the principles and evidences of Christianity, and prepared to deal alike with the pretensions of priestcraft, whether from Rome, or in Churches nearer home: the claims of state-establishments of religion, and the objections and schemes of infidelity.* On all these topics, valuable instruction is conveyed in these pages. The last especially we would mention as treated in a candid and intelligent spirit, rendering the work *very suitable to be placed in the hands of the doubting or unbelieving, and Christians may do good service to the cause they advocate, and to the souls of men, by promoting its circulation amongst them.*

The articles are all excellent, but we may specify those entitled "Christianity a Reasonable Religion," "Free Thoughts to Free-Thinkers," and "The Inscription on the Cross, its Languages and their Lessons," as peculiarly valuable. Those on "The Keys of the Kingdom, what they are and who stole them," and "Peter's Keys and the Pope's Picklocks, or Binding and Loosing," are powerful exposures of the futile attempts to establish the claims of Rome from Holy Scripture.

We conclude with the following brief extract, cordially wishing success to the undertaking.

The Hastings and St. Leonard's News, reviewing No. II. observes,—"This new periodical continues with great vigour to devote itself to the exposition of Christianity in its purity, and of Philosophy in its truthfulness; and to the exposure of the varied forms of those two great curses of humanity, Priestcraft and Infidelity. It fills a void in our literature for the people, and deserves success.

"Christianity in harmony with man's nature, present and progressive.

Seven Lectures preached in Gallowtree Gate Chapel, Leicester."

Published by request. By the Rev. GEORGE LEGGE, LL.D.
London: J. Snow.

This work, like the system whose philosophy it unfolds, is suited to all ages. It is a lucid argumentative and eloquent exhibition of the adaptation of the word of God, to the soul of man. We are glad to observe that the author "has something else in his mind, of the same sort, but on a more extensive scale, and of a more ambitious aim." Meanwhile we hail this, as a pledge of something more considerable, and earnestly commend it to the thoughtful study of our readers.

The following are the topics of the seven Lectures.

1. Christianity in harmony with man as an intellectual being.—2. With man as an imaginal being.—3. As a moral being.—4. The same continued.—5. With man as a social being.—6. As a progressional being.—7. With man's whole being and hope.

The idea is complete, and well carried out; furnishing us with another proof of the truth of the gospel, derived from its value and suitableness.

In the first Lecture, we notice one incidental statement, which if properly carried out, would prove an important principle in many doctrinal speculations: viz. "that our safest plan is to conceive of the revelation given to us, as a revelation *not of God in the absolute*, but of God in *accommodation to our need*."

Christianity came for practitioners, rather than for mere philosophers; it tells what God does, rather than what he is; and explains the relation of the Divine Being to the recovery of sinful man.

A very important suggestion is made in the same lecture, by which much modern mysticism (a cover either for rationalism or for superstition, which are closely allied) is pierced through; for whereas men have juggled with the terms "logical and intuitional consciousness," or "understanding and reason," it is clearly intimated, that (as we have long believed) *these are only operations of the same faculty on different subjects*.

The difference lies (as the logicians would say) in the nature of the "subject matter," not in the faculties of mind employed. It is nothing more than the old division of "contingent and necessary truths.

Accordingly, Dr. Legge observes, "I do not see that anything is gained, by referring these beliefs to different faculties of mind."

Our space forbids us to give specimens bearing more directly on the main object; but we gladly introduce the work to the notice of our readers.

I.

CHRIST'S RELIGION.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD." 1 Thess. v. 21.

THE BIBLE, OUR TRUE MAGNA CHARTA.

ONE great question in these days,—a mark of the advance of mankind—is the amount of freedom in all matters, to which men have a native or a social right.

A more philosophical enquiry would be, *how much of despotism or authority, is the native, social or divine right, of the recognized spiritual and temporal rules of the world.* Not to prove our claim to freedom; but to prove their claim to govern; for a priori, one man is born with no mark of distinction; neither booted nor spurred, nor with a saddle, to ride on his prostrate subjects.

Everywhere as nations are emerging from semi-barbarism, thrones are tottering, and authorities questioned: the ignorant are quiet and docile, as a herd of cattle, the property of their lordly masters; but as men rise to self-consciousness, and separate from masses into individuals, they proceed to adjust anew the question of authority and submission. Constitutions are proposed, Magna Chartas demanded, as a recognition and security for human rights. *Whence then have these questions arisen?* We do not find them in the old heathen states, republics, monarchies or empires.

Colonies revolted and were put down or triumphed by military power; slaves sometimes rose in insurrection: *but no question of human rights ever was entertained till the GREAT EMANCIPATOR had arrived, to assure the nations, "if the Son make you free, then are you free indeed."*

Neither the idea of rights, nor the true ground of them, was ever approached, either in theory or in principle, and could not possibly be, till Christianity had come to set men right with God, and with one another.

Many flourishing kingdoms had risen and fallen; but none had been the sanctuary of a true freedom, social, civil, religious or intellectual. The highest perfection of a people, was in the severity of laws, and a kind of military principle of obedience, rather than in social rights and human dignity. The Greeks, the most polished, enlightened and free, were free only in certain respects; their republics, were a citizen tyranny over non-citizens and slaves; the latter of whom were no more highly estimated, than as useful animals.

Christianity even at present, has only half conquered this, in the great

modern republic. If ever the slaves there are free, it will be the Son who makes them free, even socially and politically. He emancipated our slaves; he will disenthral the serfs of despotic countries; who are treated as live stock, only more stationary as belonging to the land on which they are born.

But there was no such deliverer for the Grecian slaves; and that high-minded people, with all its talk of freedom, never dreamed of freeing its multitudes of slaves;—*they had no rights* in the true modern and Christian sense of that word.

The name "freeman," was only a correlative to "slave," and recognised in itself the approved servitude of others.

But this power had well nigh passed away, when the Redeemer came, being trampled down and absorbed into the warrior empire of Rome, whose citizens regarded it as their rights—to live on foreign plunder.

There were therefore no elements of a rational freedom, either in practice or theory, up to the time of these words "if the Son make you free, then are ye free indeed."

Even the infidel has to thank Christ, for the liberty to declare himself; as well as for all theories of political freedom which he advocates; the theory is stolen from the Saviour who is rejected. The term "Rights of Man," assumed as a title to Paine's Political Views, would never have been coined in any other mint than that of the gospel.

THE GREAT SPIRITUAL FACTS, WHICH LIE AT THE BASIS OF HUMAN FREEDOM, ARE THE DIGNITY, IMMORTALITY, RESPONSIBILITY AND REDEMPTION OF MANKIND. This is the Magna Charta; it is God's charter of man's liberties.

And this is the point to which we shall mainly confine our attention, in this enquiry.

The simplest proof of its truth, is in the actual distinction between our treatment of men and animals. Why do we think the latter subservient to our wishes? Why do we consider the death or injuring of one, as of less consequence than that of the other? *Because we look upon man as of more native dignity and consequence in himself.* Now what is it which creates or deepens, preserves and extends this conviction in the world—what carries our impression of it to the highest degree? It is the Bible only.

First, as the Old Testament, in the history of Creation, describes the difference between the origin of man and animals; secondly, as the New Testament reveals more fully his immortal nature, his responsible character, and his redemption by Jesus Christ.

First, the Old Testament indicates plainly the dignity or *consequence* of a human being, in the history of creation, and this is the great foundation of human rights. God made all creatures, and *therefore is their guardian, a sin against their nature and intended position, is a sin against Him*: but he intended man for a peculiar position, and therefore hedged him about with a peculiar sacredness. "And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth."—(Gen. i. 26.) "And the Lord God formed man of the dust

of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.”—(Gen. ii. 7.)

This breathing into man the breath of life, is the second and higher element of human nature;—“the inspiration of the Almighty, which giveth understanding:” and in this possession of a soul, God-derived, man is distinguished from “the beasts that perish:” for the life of the brute goeth downward; but the spirit of man returneth to God that gave it.

And the image of God, in which man was created, was his *natural image*, as a being of intelligence, rights, and authority;—having dominion over his works: whilst the moral image, is that in which the Christian is created, after the likeness of the second Adam;—after God in righteousness and true holiness. But here we have man’s native dignity, his power and authority; the God over this lower world;—to rule all creatures. And for this purpose man was created as a superior being, his greater consequences is the measure of his greater rights.

The *rights of woman*, are included in those of man, which embraces mankind; on this subject also, the history of creation, is a great social and moral lesson. “And the Lord said, *it is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him.* And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the rib, which the Lord God, had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, *this is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man.* Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh.”—(Gen. ii. 18, 21—24. See also Matt. xix. 3—8.)

Here is the nearness of affinity, both in origin and in subsequent union; *equality or rather community of rights and sympathies.* This lesson, learned by Pagan nations, would place woman in her true position, *at the side of man:* it makes *man, not a lord*, but a lover and husband; woman not a *slave, but a companion*; it takes her out of the harem into the house; and *by the communion of rights and sympathies, makes that model Church of Christ, truly called a home.*

So that in the history of creation, we are taught not only the pre-eminent dignity and consequent sacredness of mankind in general; but their social relations, as afterwards more fully illustrated and enforced in the gospel.

We have already observed, that the image of God, in which man was created, was chiefly (as there described) his natural image, we shall afterwards point out, how Christianity serves to recover and complete this, by the addition or recovery of his moral likeness.

The same declaration, respecting mankind, as important and having rights founded on creation in the image of God, was mentioned again (at the re-peopling of the world by Noah,) as the basis of the world’s constitution;—a re-enacting of the original charter. “And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, upon all that moveth upon the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea; into your hand are they delivered. And

surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man."—(Gen. ix. 2, 5, 6.)

Whatever may be thought of capital punishments, as fitted for these times, the *principle* of this constitution is still applicable;—that it is a greater sin to injure man, because he "is made in the image of God." Thus the Creator has put his stamp on men,—“the image and superscription of the King of kings;” rendering all persons sacred, and all rights secure:—secure in this world, in proportion as this truth is known and obeyed; secure in the next world—as to his vengeance, on all violations of it. FOR GOD IS THE CHAMPION OF THE WEAK; so are all true men, as God's vicars on earth; whilst the wicked triumph in their short reign, in afflicting those who cannot right themselves.

It is this sacredness, from the image of God,—man's intended dignity, and real importance, that some would throw as a shield even over felons, at least to save their lives: and their argument is strengthened by the second manifestation of man's importance, as the heir of immortality revealed in the gospel.

Man therefore *was created to rule, not to be a slave*; and the natural consequence of every human being, is thus the foundation of our rights. The animals were brought for man to name; and committed to him to be ruled; we may now tame the horse; and force its power to our inclinations, because God made it for our use; but he did not confer on any the authority to degrade, insult or profane his own image.

This doctrine is the first Bible lesson; it is the true ground-work of all man's claims and duties; and is worth more than all heathen mythology and philosophical speculations: it expresses all true principles of freedom and government, in a single sentence;—“for in the image of God, made He him.” It is a portable framework for all just constitutions.

It constitutes it an insult to the Divine Being to insult or injure a human being: it is not “the divinity that doth hedge a king,” but *the divinity that doth hedge a man*. It embraces the whole human family. Thus the doctrine now advanced, not only gives man inherent dignity and common rights, but fences this by his relation to God; who made man to serve HIM, and to serve no one else: whilst he made *only animals* to serve man:—no one human being for the convenience, caprice, and tyranny of another.

The lower animals, the earth, and all manageable elements of nature, are man's servants, entrusted to him by his Creator as temporary property; but men are entrusted to none; they are God's own property, of which he is a jealous owner; whether they be stolen by others, or depart from him of themselves. And as this universal Proprietor requires all to serve him with their entire faculties, so he will not be robbed with impunity by the usurpation of one man over another.

And thus much for the Old Testament, which, though imperfect, as being introductory, still contains in the few passages we have quoted, a better charter for mankind, a plainer, simpler, and surer foundation for human rights, than is to be found in all the laws and writings of men

who have not been favoured with the help of that fuller revelation contained in the gospel. We shall not stay to refer to later instances,* where the prophets and others reprove the rulers for "grinding the faces of the poor;" the judges for not supporting the cause of the fatherless and widow, whose father and husband God is; but shall proceed to the second assertion, viz.: that Christianity in particular, strengthens this foundation of human rights, both by acknowledging and enforcing all that the Old Testament contains on this subject, and by introducing more clearly the doctrine of immortality and redemption, together with responsibility as resulting from these doctrines.

In this question we shall avail ourselves of the help of one who has given these subjects some consideration:—

"Now here allow me to notice a great principle,—which was indeed as old as humanity, and of which we have hints in the records of Judaism, and hallucinations among the sages of Gentilism, but which Jesus was the first to bring out of darkness and the twilight into the noonday: the principle, that there is in every man, as he is man, irrespectively of his outward appearance and position in the social state, an intrinsic worth and importance,—the worth and importance of a being framed in the divine image, and destined for the divine service and fruition. I say that Jesus was the first, distinctly to recognise and practically to assert this principle. Before Him, there was no clear apprehension, and the reverse of a practical acknowledgment of this among men. Throughout all the Pagan world, there was no consideration of man, simply as man, in his own individual and immortal self. A man had no rights of his own, but such as arose out of his relative position; and he had many rights, or few rights, or no rights at all, as he was a patrician or plebeian, a freedman or a slave.

Now we are introduced, in the history of Jesus, to another way of thinking and feeling about man. By his example and his ministry, he disclosed a new ideal and a new spirit of humanity. He made no account of the distinctions which separated class from class, and nation from nation. He paid no deference to the heraldic blazon, or the professional array. He accorded no homage to the territorial magnate, or the mercantile millionaire. He looked down at once on the gifted intellectualist, and the sanctimonious Pharisee. Not that he had any antipathy to the members of these classes as such; but characterised, as they too generally were, by all that was selfish and unholy, he turned from them with disdain, to clasp hands rather with Insignificance, Poverty, and Infamy. He himself chose to be the son of a mechanic, not of a monarch. He preferred as his Apostles, not the affluent and learned, but the poor and illiterate. He honoured frequently the outcast of society, more than the oracle of the synagogue. He held up the good Samaritan to admiration, while he covered the priest and the Levite with contempt. In all this, his object was to show, that in his judgment, and in the kingdom which he would establish, outward appearance was nothing, and soul was everything: man as man, was to be regarded as having, paramountly and indefeasibly, the privileges and prerogatives of an immortal. This is the principle which, I say, Jesus was the first to bring out of

* See Jeremiah xxxiv. 8—17.

darkness into marvellous light; and it is the glory of the Christian dispensation." (*Christianity in Harmony with Man's Nature, &c.* By the Rev. George Legge, LL.D.)

Thus the Son has given the world some pledges, that he will make it "free indeed."

Christianity introduced *three new elements* into the general culture of the world;—RIGHT, TRUTH, AND RIGHTS. It introduced right, or duty, as a clear moral obligation, distinguished from power or policy:—what men *ought* to do, as differing from what was fashionable, honourable, or immediately advantageous. It is questionable whether in the true and broad meaning of this word, as a matter of morals, "right" was ever used amongst the heathen; certainly it had no extensive influence; and therefore nothing could more emphatically elevate the conscience and entire nature, than this new sort of education:—writing God's laws on man's soul. Nor was it merely the introduction of this notion of right; but also telling men what was the right thing to be done; or the proper principles on which to act, which tended to secure this moral reformation.

Love instead of selfishness, was introduced as the guiding law, a *love that included justice*—"whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them:"—a love that embraced the Divine Being, with the whole power of human affection:—a love that is enforced by the highest model,—God, who is love:—a love that is guided by the instances of divine bounty, sending rain and sunshine, on the just and unjust;—a love that is enforced by the unparalleled instance of the Redeemer's own condescension to our level:—to die the just for the unjust, to bring us to God.

That says—I forgave thee all that debt, thou OUGHTEST therefore to have compassion on thy fellow servant, even as I had compassion on thee:—that says, beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another; be ye kind to one another, tender-hearted; forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake forgave us. For Christ also himself hath loved us, and given himself for us. Here then is the notion of right, or duty; enforced by obligations and instances.

Consider how great a change this was in the world;—how great a change it would be in many even now in Christian countries, to possess *this sensitiveness as to what is right*,—a conscientiousness, that regards all these duties as sacred, and thus defends all human rights by the aid of a divine impulse!

In this notion of duty, is included the perfection of a renewed nature, purity in all its forms, with the highest example, rendered forcible by the most binding motives.

It is at once the doctrine of sin, pardon, and sanctification: sin with its fearful consequences,—an immortal soul lost for ever: pardon, with the atonement on the cross by which it was procured: sanctification, by which sin is abandoned, and perfect holiness attained.

Nothing can exalt the value and consequence of man, more than this effort to exalt him from his lost estate: redemption, is at once an expression of human sinfulness and human dignity; and confers the *noblest privileges* upon the freed men of Jesus Christ.

The second element introduced by the gospel, is **TRUTH**: *men had no conception of this before, in matters of conscience and religion.* Pilate enquired "what is truth?" as if it were some new and unheard of thing: for the teachers of heathenism and its general supporters, (like some heathenized Christians) never thought of truth, but custom and policy.

Priests and rulers, employed superstition as an engine of State; the respectable followed it from indifference and fashion; the ignorant from hereditary fear.

But the idea of *truth*, was left out altogether; and therefore this new element, would exercise, quicken, and enlarge the intellect, in a new and free enquiry into the most sublime and exalting questions. Religion was no longer to be regarded as the alliance of political and priestly power, exacting a blind faith, or politic obedience; but a matter of understanding and conscience in the sight of God. And thus would the Son make men free, by making them exalted above "the conversation received by tradition from their fathers;"—above the tyranny of priestcraft, law, custom, and ignorance.

All this moreover would give men power, and consequence; and so uphold the **THIRD** element introduced by the gospel, namely **RIGHTS**. **RIGHTS** belonging not merely to the powerful and honoured, but to the weak and despised; for God by his gospel, threw a broad shield over such;—*his* regards towards them, bring them into prominence, and true dignity.

We have heard of an officer who having risen by character and ability from the ranks, was unable to equal his brother officers in riotous expense; he was consequently exposed to every annoying insult, as if an inferior and intruder, until he petitioned his superior to be degraded from his unpleasant promotion. His general finding the true cause of this request to be the insolence of his companions, arising from his poverty and so-called low origin, promised to set the matter right.

Accordingly it was arranged that as the general passed, on the next review day the complaining officer was to step forward and address him. He was received with great affability in the presence of the assembled troops; the general offering his arm, and walking companionably with him up and down the ranks. His brother officers seeing these attentions, ever afterwards treated him with respect and kindness.

So God in the person of Christ, came down, and took *our arm*, recognized the lowliest; that henceforth all even the outcast, should be sacred as his own dear purchase.

Hitherto rank and legal privilege, were the foundations of right; men appealed to the laws, as conferring their titles; God appeals to humanity as deciding what shall be the laws.

Privileges are no longer to be founded on laws, but on the native rights of our common humanity; or the purchased immunities of our Christian faith.

Whilst formerly men said, *I am a citizen*—a defence from which slaves and others were excluded—now we are to say, *I am a man*, even though a slave, and ought to be a citizen, for God has provided me a citizenship in heaven. Thus our Lord's assumption of humanity, rendered all men sacred, that *we should* "**HONOUR ALL MEN**;" and he defends the meanest

of his flock, with this cheering declaration,—“forasmuch as ye did it to the *least of these my little ones*, YE DID IT UNTO ME.” It was this great truth, which elevated the run-away slave of Philemon, into a “brother beloved.”—(See Philemon 10—16.) The gospel did not directly disturb social arrangements, but introduced those principles which would first modify and then overthrow every injustice; hence the same Apostle gives directions to slaves.—(1 Cor. vii. 17—23.)

Here Christ hath freed men from all obligations to circumcision, the entire ritual of Judaism; whilst he elevates social slaves, to a moral position, in which they cannot much longer be held in bondage.

Here are no commands against bettering their condition; “*but if thou mayest be free, use it rather.*” Christ wants none of his servants to remain in bonds: and the constitution he has provided, is not such as politicians aim at,—what is suited to people now, till they are fit for a better;—his constitution is to *make them better*. And this will include social, political, and religious freedom: no Christian people can long be enslaved.

We thus become free, from the tyranny of arbitrary power; from the claims of encroaching priests; for if we have Christ—what do we want besides? We become free from the creeds and dogmas of men; all Church authorities; having Christ for our only Ruler; and therefore being above the dictation and intervention of men. We can walk to heaven along a road he opens, and which none can shut; “for if the Son make you free, then are ye free indeed.”

We have none above us but Christ, who hath freed us from all others—that we should become his servants. Whilst our earthly masters, are themselves brought under authority, “knowing that *their* Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him.”

But is not *this* slavery? that we should be absolutely under his dominion? No! It is slavery to be under ourselves; to have our conscience bound by our sins; our reason imprisoned by passion; our soul led captive by the Devil at his pleasure; this is slavery, to be sold under sin; because it is beneath the position to which this divine charter invites us.

A proper service is not opposed to freedom; *it is servitude* or slavery, a *degrading service* that is contrary to true freedom. EMANCIPATION, IS TO FIND OUR RIGHT MASTER;—to be made free from sin, and become the servants of righteousness.—(Rom. vi. 18.)

We cannot become altogether free from law, the most licentious obeys his own passions, and is thus enslaved.

The freest libertine and man of the world, is obedient to the law of honour and fashion; he is *free from God*, but not from obedience to another kind of rule.

Law itself is not slavery, but good laws are the sanctuary of freedom. True liberty consists in having no laws or ruling influences which prevent the due development of an individual's character, or of a nation's resources.

He is a slave who is under laws which are unfit for a man, that put him below his true place and stunt his growth. His emancipation consists in coming under laws suitable to a man, as a brother and an equal in God's universal family of mankind.

So of a people politically, freedom is not release from laws, but from injurious and oppressive laws.

Freedom in commerce is the absence of interfering agencies, of everything inconsistent with its nature and design; and the presence of its true regulators—the laws of God's providence.

So mental and spiritual freedom for man, is the absence or subjugation of inferior impulses; escape from the tyranny of evil habits; the law of the mind subduing the law of sin in our members;—the rule of God's higher and spiritual providence; in which *the truth makes us free* from false hopes and false fears, and the various chains of delusion.

It is to ascend from the rule of sense, to rule of thought, enlightened by the loftiest truths.

The most perfect liberty is obedience to the highest laws, not those of sense or earth, or of God's creatures, but of God himself; not priests, fashion, human authority, nor bodily appetites, but the direct and perfect will of God. All else, is *being a SERVANT OF SERVANTS*, which is slavery; while liberty is to be the servant of the Great King.

The nearer we come to the source of authority, the more freedom we enjoy; and the more we descend to obeying lower laws and authorities or obtrusive usurpations, the more we lose this advantage of nearness, live *under a lower roof*, instead of the dome of heaven which is the temple of God's law and man's liberty.

And from this we may learn that it is no slavery to be under Christ, because he is truly above us all;—peerless in majesty and greatness of character, unequalled in the extent of the spiritual truths and privileges which he has made known in the gospel constitution.

The greatness of this master, prevents all cramping slavery and degradation, which result from submitting to an equal or an inferior. Here we find the rule of reason, not of brute force; thoughts and affections, not chains and prisons; for "God in Christ" rules the believer by the great motives and reasons of the gospel. There he reveals our immortal nature, and hopes and duties suitable to it.

We have here ample room to advance, and shall never outgrow our lesson; never feel like a caged eagle vainly beating against a narrow cage, since we have the free expanse of the firmament in which to move, and the glorious Sun of all intelligence to illuminate our course.

This greatness in our Ruler, and the extent of his laws, embracing the circumference of all that is noble and possible for man, form our security, that we cannot be slaves whilst under his dominion: and his *sole authority*, in all questions of thought, religion, and character, defends us from the oppressions and subletting of middlemen, who would parcel out and take God's own domain,—the wide common of human liberties.

II.

PRIEST'S RELIGION.

HUMAN AUTHORITY AND INVENTION *versus* CONSCIENCE AND THE BIBLE.

The Scriptures are the only standard of Christian faith and practice: every one is at liberty to examine them; but no one is at liberty to decline this examination: and though we may receive the help of others, we may not rest on their authority, (which is man-worship;) nor receive as religion, what is not in the Scriptures, (which is will-worship.)

ROME'S LOGIC: SCHEME THE FIRST.

"WITH ALL DECEIVABLENESS OF UNRIGHTEOUSNESS."—2 Thess. ii. 10.

NOTWITHSTANDING the diversity of opinion in politics and in religion, it is manifest that men's minds are cast in the same original mould; though by some peculiar fascination we are led to the most opposite conclusions.

This cannot be entirely explained by the various motives of interest, partizanship, and ambition, though these have naturally a blinding influence.

There are however subtler and deeper principles at work,—fallacies of the understanding—false starting points, by which men become so influenced as firmly to believe, what others looking at the same doctrines directly and alone, feel to be inherently absurd, if not blasphemous. This does not result from any difference in *general* education, nor from any difference in general power of understanding; but partly from a *difference of education on the particular points in question*: one set of persons having been trained to judge for themselves, and so feeling a confidence as well as acquiring mastery and insight into that particular department. One has an implicit faith and follows, not judging whither; the other aims at an intelligent faith on each separate point, and so is individually a better judge of the road. One relinquishes the right, and therefore loses the power of private judgment, and so can sincerely believe, what those whose "senses are exercised to discern between good and evil," can scarcely regard as possible to be believed, by otherwise intelligent men.

This difference in procedure, leads us deeper into those questions on which men's minds are agitated, to find a sufficient explanation for these varieties of opinion. It is always of importance to understand our true foundations, in matters of such importance as belong to religion; and especially in times of fluctuation, change, and fear; when doctrines are caught by contagion and defended by prejudice; when priestcraft is

subtle and statecraft cruel, and men must make their choice in the din of contention, and maintain it in the face of derision.

To have a clear steady light for the wise and the simple, a sun walking in brightness and shining purely through the clouds of incense and smoking torches of a full grown superstition, and shaming the unlighted candles of a Protestant abortion—this is the great need of these and of all times. Thank God, this is provided for us in his own blessed word—a light unto our feet, and a lamp unto our paths; the beaming forth of him who is a sun and shield, the Father of lights, in whom is no variable-ness nor shadow of turning;—a being of undiminished glory and majesty, a sun that is never eclipsed.

They who come simply unto this marvellous light of the glorious gospel of the blessed God; find rest unto their souls.

But since so many persons are entangled by the network of superstition thrown around the Bible, by which its light becomes darkness; it is necessary to unravel these spiritual delusions, that men may no longer be bound down to the couch of indolence by the cobwebs of human authority.

Thus, finding wherein our great strength lieth—in the spirit of the Lord coming upon us mightily—(by the demonstration and power of his revealed truth,) we may burst “the green withs” of an effeminate superstition, that would bind us in slavery to the household gods “received by TRADITION from our fathers.”

Our present enquiry is entered upon in order to contribute our share towards establishing such as are free men in Christ, and emancipating such as are enslaved to Anti-Christ.

We would at least aim at a true “Catholic Emancipation Act;” not only as emancipating as far as possible those called Catholics, but making our remedy itself *Catholic* by making it *universal*.

This can be done only by examining those starting points whence we diverge into opposite directions;—the principles of enquiry which lead to such contrary results.

And here let it be observed as an important distinction, *that on no questions but on those of superstition and immediate self-interest, do men ever think of departing from the principles of common sense in explaining any documents.* If a high churchman has to explain some article or a low churchman some service of the Church of England, both immediately take to evasions, and varieties of construction; seeking some method of distorting an unwilling sentence into some “charitable,” “hypothetical,” “grammatical,” “positive,” or “non-natural” sense. All these senses and constructions, and many more, are continually resorted to in such cases. Now, why is this? It is because men wish to reconcile conscience with interest and understanding;—to make the crooked appear straight: and the only way to do it, is to make conscience itself crooked, and acquire a twist in our spiritual vision.

In no other matters do men ask in what sense words are to be received:—an invitation to dinner, or an offer of promotion, is understood in English; the words in this case, have only one sense, only one possible construction.

But when it is a question of this kind—can we believe what we do not

believe; can we sign a document, or conduct a service, which contradicts our high or low Church doctrines, and so preserve our status?—immediately men betake themselves to the varieties of construction and different senses which the words will bear. Take it therefore as a maxim, that **WHENEVER SOME PECULIAR METHODS OF CONSTRUCTION ARE APPLIED TO ANY DOCUMENT, SOME SINISTER END IS TO BE SERVED.**

Even Catholics will admit this, in reference to Protestant evasions: and each party in the Established Church, will admit the maxim against Protestant opponents in the same Church.

Will it not then also fairly apply to the Catholic method of dealing with the Bible?

A book of history, science, or philosophy,—or any subject within the range of human knowledge, is left to the private judgment of its readers; there is *no chemical or astronomical Church*, whose decisions we are to receive, and in *whose sense* we are to interpret such books. We canvass them by the usual laws of language, we try their assertions by the proper methods of evidence, and are under no sort of tutorship or mental vassalage.

We are allowed to deal with all other books but one, as we deal with words in conversation,—receive them in the sense and to the extent to which they commend themselves to our unfettered judgment.

But as soon as we come to the Bible, we are told by a vast fraternity of priests, that we are to receive *this book in their sense*: which plainly implies that we have no sense of our own. Hence we are consistently termed children,—the sons and daughters of the Church, *who never grow up*, but are always in swaddling clothes, under the absolute control of their venerable mother. This is the true way of stunting the world's growth, and producing a race of dwarfs, instead of giants. "When I *was* a child," says the Apostle, "I spake as a child, I thought as a child, I understood as a child; but *when I became a man*, I put away childish things."

If therefore, as was before agreed respecting Protestant constructions,—it is a truth that men set up a peculiar sense (which applies to no other document) only when they have some sinister end to serve; what are we to conclude respecting those teachers who calling themselves our mother, allow every other book to be read by the light of our own understanding; but set forth this one blessed book of God as an exception? Have they not also some sinister end to serve—their own power and ambition?

Does not this explain to us how intelligent men having handed their judgments over to the Church, and placed confidence in her interpretations of the Bible, are prepared to receive doctrines or follow practices contrary to its plainest statements and spirit.

It is in cultivating such a disposition as this, that ROME'S LOGIC acquires a demonstrating power. Let this one point be conceded,—*"I believe what the Church believes,"* and all ordinary logic is at an end.

Therefore in dealing with these delusions, it is not enough (for the satisfaction of Catholics) to prove a doctrine absurd or unscriptural; we must begin at the beginning, and prove that *"the Church is fallible,"*—a false and dangerous authority. But since this doctrine of "the

Church," is not the only false principle assumed, though it is the leading delusion, we shall endeavour to *classify, analyze, and illustrate the various branches of Roman Logic*, by which separately and combined, the whole of that enormous fabric is built up and supported.

The following are the main branches of this scheme;—the *different* methods of defending or palliating the doctrine and practices of the Roman Catholic Religion.

1. THE LITERAL SENSE OF A PASSAGE : (a fallacy of Etymology ; the literal scarcely ever being the sense of any phrase, either in books or conversation.)

2. In another case, for another purpose ;—INFERENCE or explanation, by which the so-called literal sense is abandoned.

3. ALLUSIONS to passages that have no connexion but in sound with the subject. (In other words, *falsification*.)

4. An appeal to the rites of JUDAISM.

5. The assumption of relics, images, &c. as USEFUL.

6. The crowning dogma that saves the whole,—THE CHURCH'S AUTHORITY.

Without altogether confining ourselves to a separate and formal examination of each of these, in the order here mentioned, we shall endeavour to point out, how each comes in as occasion serves: for *taking all these methods together, there is no one thing, however good or bad, that might not be proved*. They are not consistent principles, but manœuvres, evasions, special pleadings, or dodges ;—to save this system by hook or by crook: by force or by craft; the sword or the mitre, the bludgeon or the pastoral staff ;—robbery or forgery ; violence or cajolery.

It is by the examination of these principles, and not merely a history of the enormities and persecutions of Rome, that we are to try the pretensions of this Roman Catholic Church. For if the principles they assume be true, they are quite right in persecuting whenever they have the power. Church authority covers everything. Whatever Church, whether Protestant or Catholic, "hath power to decree ceremonies and authority in matters of faith," a power which the Church of England claims, in her XXth Article, in imitation of Rome,—whatever Church has this authority, in the sense there intended, has authority to persecute.

We shall examine some of these branches of Rome's Logic separately, and others incidentally, as being brought up like reserved forces, to help when the first pretence falls through.

I. The first of these methods, or arguing from the letter of Scripture, is a very innocent looking principle, since however absurd may be the conclusions from it, there is great show of reverence for the Scriptures, by clinging to their *literal sense*. This is very apt to throw a Protestant off his guard, and then being thus exposed, he is thrust through with some other sense.

What person for instance can deny the plain Scriptural declaration—"Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my Church; the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

This of course settles the point; and it would settle the Pope, if we were to take this principle of the literal sense and hold the Romanists to it. For what have they to do with this saying of Christ: is it not the

literal Peter, and the *literal* rock? Whereas, immediately they bring in inferences, councils, fathers, Church authority, and directly *manufacture a figurative Peter and a figurative rock*. Hold them to any *literal* text, and they cannot get beyond the text; they must stop there and never travel to Rome; they must be satisfied with the *literal* Peter, and never reach to Peter's successors.

Is this then what they intend—to adopt a *literal* principle of interpretation? By no means, this is a good rock to start upon; but it is soon left for another evasion, and we find ourselves knee deep in the mud of assumption as they step from this *literal* saying of Christ,—“*thou art Peter;*” to this *figurative* saying of their own—“*we are Peter.*”

This is transubstantiation at once.

The Scriptures are not quoted, nor the *literal* sense assumed, because Catholics found their doctrines on the Scriptures, for they found them on the Church, but they appeal to the Scriptures in any convenient sense as a veil and pretence to delude men into the false belief that the Church is founded on the Scriptures.

When you get a little further in, they will tell you a different tale; as we shall see.

Thus in “the Catholic Christian Instructed; by lawful authority,”* the question comes—“how many godfathers and godmothers may a person have in the Catholic Church?”

Now what chapter and verse of the Bible does the “Right Rev. Dr.” quote, to answer this in a “*literal* sense?” He refers to the Church's Bible,—“The Council of Trent, Sess. 24. chap. ii.”

Thus does Rome's logic, begin with the mermaid's head, to captivate, but ends with the dragon's tail. How consistently the *literal* sense of Scripture is carried out, is further evident, in the following instruction for the “Catholic Christian.” “The priest blows three times upon the face of the person who is baptized, saying, ‘depart out of him or her, O unclean spirit, and give place to the Holy Ghost the Comforter.’ St. Augustine calls it a most ancient *tradition*: it is used *in contempt of Satan*, and to drive him away by the Holy Ghost, who is called the breath or Spirit of God.”

Here are *literal* Scriptures, a most ancient tradition, and the Holy Spirit of God, quoted from the Bible respecting the *breath of a priest*. This, instead of being in contempt of Satan, is in contempt of, and blasphemy against God.

Therefore, whenever Catholics quote Scripture, ask them how long they mean to keep open that battery?

Their most prominent use of this first method, is on the doctrine of TRANSUBSTANTIATION; it was to save this absurdity, that the absurd *literal-sense* doctrine was fabricated: as men tell one lie, to defend another. So the doctrine that the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ, is upheld by transubstantiating language out of sense into non-sense.

“How do you prove the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in this sacrament? A. I prove it *first* from the express and plain words of Christ himself—at the first institution, recorded in no less than four

* By the Right Rev. Dr. Challoner.

places, viz.: Matt. xxvi. 26, 27. Mark xiv. 22, 24. Luke xxii. 19. 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25. *This is my body, . . . this is my blood, &c.*

"The words themselves plainly speak for us; for Christ did not say *this is a figure of my body*, but *this is my body*. It is the duty of our opponents, as they value the salvation of their souls, to beware of offering violence to texts so plain, and of wresting them from their evident meaning."

Surely our Right Rev. Instructor forgets to tell his readers some equally plain things, as that our Lord said, "I am the door," and therefore he is equally transubstantiated into wood, as well as into a wafer. And we must not wrest so plain a passage from its evident meaning. Christ did not say I am the figure of a door, but I *am* the door. In like manner he called Herod a Fox; and the priests of his day he called serpents, generation of vipers: therefore Herod was a real Fox, and the priests real vipers: though of the true line of succession.

These things however, the modern priests by no means admit: they agree to cling to the literal sense when no *necessity* drives them to another sense. That is, *when it suits them*. "Thou art Peter," our Lord said, "and on this rock will I build my Church;" he did not say "thou and thy successors;" but in this case we are allowed to leave the literal sense, from the necessity of saving the Pope.

And if any thing else be wanted, the most approved Roman doctors tell us, that "tradition no less than Scripture is the rule of faith;" so that they enforce the literal sense in some places, depart from it in others, and introduce as equal to the Scriptures, that tradition which they call the "unwritten word of God." And the same reason why they interpret—*this is my body*—literally, is given for DEPARTING FROM THE LETTER ALTOGETHER; namely, as Dr. Milner tells us respecting Tertullian, that "this eloquent father proves at great length, the *necessity* of admitting *tradition no less than Scripture* as the rule of faith, INASMUCH AS MANY IMPORTANT POINTS which he mentions CANNOT BE PROVED WITHOUT IT!"

So this Catholic Doctor advocates the necessity of employing other evidence than the Scriptures—anything to carry their point. Then it is hypocrisy in such writers to appeal to the Scriptures at all. But when the point of transubstantiation is to be gained, they will keep us to the literal sense of the written word—so much do they respect the Bible—whilst to gain some other point, they appeal to the unwritten word. This is playing fast and loose; it is a spiritual game of thimble-rig; in which the masters of the ceremony know how to take advantage.

The chief argument for taking the words of this institution in what is called a literal sense, is "the authority of the best and most authentic interpreter, viz. his holy Church, which has always understood them in their plain literal sense, and condemned all those who have presumed to wrest them to a figure." (Challoner. Catholic Christian Instructed.) The same reason is given for not placing this saying amongst the other figurative expressions of our Lord, namely because the Church takes the other side. So these men first make an assertion, and then give their word in proof of it: this is *Rome's Logic*.

* "The End of Religious Controversy;" the Rev. John Milner, D.D. Letter X.

Another passage that has nothing to do with the sacrament, is adduced in support of the same doctrine—"He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life."—(John vi.) On this passage it is properly objected, (in the Catholic Christian Instructed,)—"does not Christ promise *eternal life* (St. John vi. 51, 54, 58.) to EVERY ONE that eateth of that bread of which he is there speaking; which promise cannot be understood with relation to the sacrament, which many receive to their own damnation."—(1 Cor. xi 29.)

This is a very reasonable—a fatal objection, but the Right Rev. instructor has an evasion ready. This promise of eternal life to every one that eateth this bread "is to be understood—provided he eat it worthily, and persevere in the grace he thereby receives." Thus he brings in this passage for the literal sense, of Christ's body and blood, but makes it a hypothetical sense as to the eternal life equally plainly asserted!

But in reference to this very sacrament, founded on the literal sense, the priests have decided against that sense; even in the words of the institution.

For whereas men are both to eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, the Church which pretends to a literal obedience has decided that "we sufficiently comply with the precept," by only obeying half of it.

The whole is completed by referring to "those innumerable texts of Scripture which prove the unerring authority of the Church, and the indispensable obligation of the faithful to follow the judgment of the Church, . . . and that all Christians are obliged to yield to this decision."

Thus this Roman Church, comes and says her doctrines are literal Scripture statements; then that we can do without Scripture, or change its directions, and finally falls back on the safe support of her own boldness. It is true we have two further pretences, namely the "consent of the Greeks and all the Oriental Christians:" besides that "both ancient and modern Church history furnish us with many instances of miracles—wrought in testimony of this sacred truth."

If we enquire how is it possible for "the whole body and blood of Christ to be contained in so small a space as the host, nay even in the smallest sensible particle of it?"

Dr. Challoner replies,—“by the Almighty power by which a camel can pass through the eye of a needle.” Persons would scarcely credit that this is the sober answer of a Right Rev. instructor. Now no Almighty power could perform this contradiction.

Here then are *millions of complete Christs humanity and divinity*, at every general service of the Mass; each particle being a full Christ; and the entire divinity being in each,—because say they—"the flesh profiteth nothing;" and hence the soul, divine and human, is there, with the body! And this body eaten so many times over, (each taking more than a particle, and so all eating several Christs at once,) is "the same body as that which was born of the blessed virgin, and which suffered for us on the cross." (Challoner) Which "cannot be divided," and therefore all take it whole; and indeed several entire bodies at once; "by the same power by which the camel goes through the eye of a needle."

Thus when we leave the simplicity of God's truth, and make ourselves absurd, absurdity will itself be revenged upon us.

After all these elaborate attempts to impose on us a literal sense of this institution, who would expect the following instruction for Catholic Christians? "Why do the faithful in the Catholic Church, receive only under the form of wine and not also under the form of bread? A. *The Catholic Church has always looked upon it AS A THING INDIFFERENT* whether the faithful receive in one kind or both." Yet she pretends to a literal obedience to Christ's institution! "But her custom and discipline for many ages have been to administer this sacrament to the laity in one kind only; by reason of the danger of spilling the blood of Christ, if all were to receive the cup." But may not the priests spill it? And where is the danger from spilling this wine? Are we not told by the same authority, that "the body of Christ in the sacrament cannot be hurt or divided"—that "it is now immortal and impassable?" Then it could not be hurt by being spilled, and surely would not hurt others. So that this danger, of which Christ never thought, is also a foolish pretence, on the priest's own shewing. In fact this is merely a subterfuge, the grand reason is the priests' power to make a distinction between the people and themselves. Hence we are told that "the Catholic Church did at one time allow of the communion in both kinds; *and may again if she please*, for this is a matter of discipline, *which the Church MAY REGULATE OR ALTER AS SHE SHALL SEE MOST EXPEDIENT.*" (Challoner.)

Is it not then mere mockery to start with an appeal to the literal sense of Scripture, on a point which is immediately to be regulated by the Church, contrary to express commandment? We are told indeed, that the command, "drink ye all of it," was only to the twelve Apostles. Then, both kinds belong only to their successors; for none of the laity were present at the institution, in whole or part. Then why give it to the laity at all? Where is your *literal* obedience?

But yet the laity, though they receive only in one kind, receive in two kinds; for, says the same authority, in vindicating *one* kind, "whosoever receives the body of Christ, most certainly receives his blood at the same time; since the body he receives is a living body (for Christ can die no more, Rom. vi. 9,) which cannot be without blood. There is no taking Christ by pieces; whoever receives him, receives him entirely."

Therefore again, THERE ARE AS MANY ENTIRE CHRISTS AS COMMUNICANTS; nay, as many as possible divisions of the wafers; multiplied into the number of times the mass is celebrated! And this communion in one kind, is communion in two kinds, eating and drinking, only no one knows it.

The defenders of a literal interpretation, take a further literal step, by turning away from the terms of Christ's institution, and finding "many places of Scripture speaking of the holy communion, without mention of the cup." As if this would take the cup out of the one text they begin with. But the literal meaning is again evaded, by observing "secondly, that the Scripture promises life eternal to those who receive in one kind."
—(St. John vi. 51, 57, 58.)

It happens, unfortunately for these men's regard for Scripture, that these verses so picked out, omit the verses between, *verses that positively command both*. It would be impossible to find a grosser instance of literary imposture, than this Right Rev. way of quoting the Bible. Let

any one read the 53, 54, 55, 56 verses ; and see how honest it is to prove that one kind is Scriptural, because they leave out the Scriptures which command the other, and then stand up for a literal interpretation.

But the next demonstration of one kind, from literal Scripture, is equally forcible—"Thirdly, the ancient Church most certainly allowed communion in one kind," which is proved by a number of Fathers. But the ancient Church, would have best shown its title to that name, by obeying the Lord of the true Church.

"But what would you further say," enquires the innocent Catechumen, "to a scrupulous soul, which through the prejudice of a protestant education, could not perfectly easy upon this article?" A. "I should refer such a person to the Church and her authority, and to all those divine promises recorded in the Scripture, by which we are assured that in hearing the Church and her pastors, we are secure."

So we come round again, from the literal word of God, to the authority of a Church which thus would enfeeble human intellects, confound all principles of reason ; appeal to the literal word, and then appeal against it, to some unwritten word ; and then appeal to the Church ;—that is, a suspected witness, who having made great pretensions, appealed to documents, said and unsaid, prevaricated, juggled and mystified, finally crowns the insolent aggression on the common sense of the jury, by resting the whole enormous fabric—on her own word and honour! *About which there can be no question.*

Hitherto, we have examined only one of the six branches of Rome's Logic, the literal sense of the Scriptures ;—"thou art Peter," "*this is my body, this is my blood:*" and have seen what a vast pile of fraud and falsehood is reared on this precarious foundation.

Let these points, together with what we have yet to advance on the other five Roman prevarications be clearly understood, and Protestantism could be in no danger for all the efforts of its enemies : whilst Catholics themselves, finding their acknowledged principles handled, without raking up a history of actual enormities, would be likely to relinquish their bondage to this network of spiritual delusion. This however will not be done by violence and clamour ; nor by those men who are hampered by a Catholic system of their own :—by none but enlightened, honest, and thorough Protestants ; who are masters at the true sword exercise, in which God's spirit provides the weapon ; and over which God's blessing is the shield.

God forbid that we should persecute our fellow men : God forbid that we should be silent as to those errors by which they are enthralled :—may he awaken in our souls, a more ardent love of his truth ; a more sincere reliance on his Son ;—a more thorough allegiance to the Great King,—the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls ! Let his book be our creed, his Son our Redeemer—his palace our eternal home !

III.

STATESMEN'S RELIGION.

**"EVERY PLANT WHICH MY HEAVENLY FATHER HATH NOT PLANTED,
SHALL BE ROOTED UP."**—(Matt. xv. 13.)

In those who think a national Church right, dissent is a sin ; in those who think it wrong, silence is a shame.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL MARRIAGE BILL.

TO THE MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD, THE LORD ARCHBISHOP
OF CANTERBURY.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,

England has of late been edified by the discussion of Bible questions, both in the Commons House of Parliament, and in the House of Temporal and Spiritual Peers.

In the debate upon the Bill, proposing to legalize marriage with a deceased wife's sister, much was said respecting the meaning and authority of the Scriptures. It is not my intention to enter into that immediate question, the lawfulness of such marriages ; but whilst holding a different opinion to that of your Lordship, I most heartily concur in the principles you are reported to have laid down, and beg to remind your grace of their legitimate applications.

The Times (Feb. 26th, 1851,) reports your Lordship's observations as follows :—" he (the Archbishop of Canterbury) had a duty to perform, which he must not hesitate to fulfil. It would not, however, be necessary to trouble their lordships at any length ; the argument on which he relied, and on which he grounded his opinion, lay in a small compass ; in fact, he considered that the question at issue had been decided for them, being already settled by the law of God. (Hear hear.) And surely it was no slight advantage that it should be so settled, and that on a subject involving so many interests, and exciting such strong feelings, as the subject of marriage, a line should be drawn for us beyond which we must not deviate."

There could not be a more solid or important maxim, indeed it is the very essence of religion, that what is settled by the law of God, should be the only rule for the servants of God.

Without entering into the propriety of another statement that " this law is laid down in Leviticus xviii. 18," which may (like many other things) be *the law of God for the Jews and not for Christians*, since

"He hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son;" it is sufficient that the rule be acknowledged.

We are thus at liberty to apply this rule to other questions, intimately related to your Lordship's position, and affecting other duties which we "must not hesitate to fulfil."

Suppose then, most Rev. Prelate, that the debate should now arise, as to THE PROPRIETY OF YOUR LORDSHIP AND YOUR EPISCOPAL BRETHREN HOLDING YOUR POSITION AS LEGISLATORS IN THE HOUSE OF PEERS,—should not this be settled first?

And would it not be a great "advantage, that a subject involving so many interests, and exciting such strong feelings," should be "decided for us," "already settled by the law of God?"

Many other difficulties of legislation would be removed, if this right to legislate, (as a part of the alliance between the Church and the world,) were clearly decided.

Your Lordship will not object with a right Rev. Prelate (on the occasion above referred to) that "it is distasteful to him, to turn their lordship's house into an arena for Biblical criticism."

It will surely be acknowledged, that wherever bishops by virtue of their office share in any business, THERE SHOULD BE THE ARENA OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

And if in the very first question,—their right to be in such a place,—the Bible (on which their office is supposed to be founded) settles the question against them, then it is out of taste for prelates to turn that House into an arena for Biblical criticism.

Wherever this is improper, there a Bishop is out of place. And consequently this observation of the Bishop of Norwich, was a manifest apology for his presence, where the word of God could not be introduced without a violation of taste.

My Lord Archbishop, we have many graver questions to settle in Biblical enquiries, than the meaning of Leviticus xviii. 18. We have to learn that Christian people are not Jews, and Christian teachers not Levites: that Christ is our Saviour and King, and that his kingdom is not of this world. It is "no slight advantage" to have these things "settled for us by the law of God:" but it is a grievous sin to set at nought the word of God by our traditions, and alter what God has settled:—to separate what God hath joined together; and to unite what God hath separated—the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of this world.

We want a BILL OF DIVORCEMENT, as well as a Marriage Bill; that the Church should no longer be "unequally yoked together with unbelievers."

Indeed the Church has received *hire and not a dowry*; she is not married, but degraded.

Her supposed marriage bond, of Articles, Canons, and Prayer Book, are the *service* imposed by the "Supreme Governors of the Church of England," and any alteration in this stipulated obedience or servitude, is to be made by "the bishops and clergy from time to time in convocation," who "shall have *licence* under our Broad Seal, to deliberate of, and do all such things as being made plain by them and consented to by us, shall concern the *settled continuance of the doctrine* and discipline

of the Church of England, now established; *from which we will not endure any departing in the least degree.*"*

This is not wooing like a lover, but reigning like a master or tyrant. It is the Church's bondage, not a wedding.

The other Articles of this marriage-settlement, called Canons, are introduced with equal imperiousness. As James declares, "We of our *especial grace* and mere motion, by virtue of our PREROGATIVE ROYAL and Supreme Authority," "give and grant" "full, free, and lawful liberty" to the representatives of the Church, "to treat, debate, consider, and consult upon such canons, orders, ordinances, and constitutions as they should think necessary, fit, and convenient."

These representatives "having met together, by virtue of our said authority granted to them," at the time and place appointed, and "having agreed upon certain Canons, orders, &c., *to the end and purpose* BY US LIMITED AND PRESCRIBED *unto them*; and having thereupon offered and presented the same unto us, *humbly desiring us to give our royal assent*, according to the form of a certain Statute or Act of Parliament: . . . we have therefore for us our heirs and lawful successors, given our royal assent, *according to the form of* THE SAID STATUTE OR ACT OF PARLIAMENT."†

In all this, your Lordship will perceive a settlement by the law of man, the aforesaid Statute, or Act of Parliament, not the law of God.

Whilst if it be called a marriage, it is of that peculiar nature, IN WHICH THE HUSBAND CREATES THE WIFE; for the Church of England (would we look with open eyes at plain facts) is nothing else but these Articles, Canons and Prayer Book.

These become constituted into the fiction called a Church, by the process of royal assent and Acts of Parliament.

And it is proper that the Church being the creature of the State, should first be created by the State.

It is this Marriage Bill, my Lord Archbishop, that you are bound to examine, by the word of God.

Nor is it a slight advantage that these things are settled for us by the highest authority.

Christ hath given a constitution to his Church, in a work called the New Testament, written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

But in this divine book, containing the *Apostle's Creed* and the *Apostolical Constitutions*, we find nothing of "the Supreme Governor of the Church in these realms;" nothing of Acts of Parliament; no House for Spiritual Peers, nothing of these subsequent outgrowths into formality and splendour, wealth and political alliance.

Look, my Lord, into the New Testament, to see what is required of a minister, and then compare it with the following requisite for entering orders in the Church as BY LAW established.

"Canon 36. *Subscription required of such as are to be made ministers.* No person shall hereafter be received into the ministry, nor suffered to preach, to catechise, &c. except he shall first subscribe to these three Articles following, in such manner and sort as we have here appointed.

* His Majesty's declaration, prefixed to the Articles, and printed in the Book of Common Prayer.

† Royal Assent, prefixed to the Canons.

I. That the Queen's Majesty, under God, is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other Her dominions and countries, *as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal.*

II. That the Book of Common Prayer, and of Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, *containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God*, and that it may lawfully so be used; and that he himself will use the form in the said book prescribed, in public prayer and administration of the sacraments, *and none other.*

III. That he alloweth the Book of Articles of Religion agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces and the whole clergy in convocation, holden at London, in the year of Our Lord one thousand five hundred and sixty two; and that he acknowledgeth all and every of the Articles therein contained, being in number nine and thirty, besides the Ratification, to be agreeable to the word of God.

To these three articles whosoever will subscribe, he shall, for the avoiding of all ambiguities, subscribe in this order and form of words, setting down both his Christian and Surname, viz.: I, N. N. do willingly and *ex animo* subscribe to these three articles above mentioned, *and to all things that are contained in them.*"

The first requisite for a minister, is the recognition of what Christianity *has certainly omitted*, and which is contrary to its most peculiar principles. That the monarch of these realms, is a *spiritual monarch, as much as a political one*; having equal authority in either province.

Persecution, or rather (to speak constitutionally,) prosecution, has failed to secure the recognition of this authority, and hence *our Queen has not half a kingdom spiritually*, while she has a vast dominion politically, extending to those who are rebels against her spiritual throne.

HER RIGHTS HAVE NOT BEEN DEFENDED, Parliament has allowed the Crown to be despoiled of its highest prerogative, which (*de facto*) exists now only in the first Article, signed *ex animo* by every clergyman.

The Protestant Government of England has been more tenacious of the rights of bishops, than of the rights of the throne. For whilst dissenters have successfully invaded the spiritual prerogatives of majesty, the prerogatives of diocesan bishops are to be severely guarded by an *Ecclesiastical Titles Bill.*

But, my Lord, by what part of the law of God, is it settled for us, that the monarch of these realms has a rightful "supremacy in spiritual as in temporal" affairs?

It is on this assumption that our Most Rev. and Right Rev. Prelates sit in the Upper House as Peers of Parliament, instead of preachers of the gospel.

The second Article in the 36th Canon, affords wider scope for enquiry:—"that the Book of Common Prayer, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God."

All this might be true, and yet the marriage of the Church with the State, by a dowry bestowed on the Prayer Book, still be invalid. The full investigation of the truth of everything contained in the Prayer Book; belongs not to Statesmen's Religion, but to Priests' Religion; for the legitimacy of the union here enquired into, depends not on the truth or falsehood of the opinions formed into the Church.

Yet I may enquire how with your Lordship's views of spiritual reli-

gion, you can prove from the word of God, the doctrine that "it hath pleased Almighty God to regenerate this infant" by baptism? Also in what chapter and verse, we are to find the ceremony of confirmation, in that delusion?

Your Lordship will not put us off with the evasion of sound for meaning,—that the Apostles went about preaching, "*confirming* the souls of the disciples, exhorting them to continue in the faith."—(Acts xiv. 22.) This confirmation was preaching the word; *it was not hearing youths say their Catechism*; it was no vain ceremony of laying on hands that can convey nothing but delusion, to confirm in mistakes those who can only parrot-like, repeat certain prescribed words.

Where then do we find the English and Roman ceremony of confirmation in the word of God?

Is the repeating of Catechism, a good confession? And is it in accordance with the divine law, to refer to "*Baptism*" instead of *conversion*—"wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven?"

Is it consistent with the word of God, and with common experience, for the bishop in *confirming*, thus to pray—"Almighty and everliving God, *who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants by water and the Holy Ghost*, and hast given unto them forgiveness of all their sins, &c.?"

My Lord, no one that understands the gospel, can believe in the truth of the assertion made thus solemnly in prayer to Almighty God.

Not one in a hundred, brought up for confirmation, is regenerated by the Holy Ghost; their only regeneration, is the ability to repeat the Lord's prayer, the ten commandments, and certain answers from the Catechism.

Is not the entire system, A CONTRACT TO SAVE THE NATION BY A SET OF FORMS,—baptism, confirmation, and burial? Can we thus presume to promise "sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord?"

"The ordering of priests and deacons," is not more consistent with Christianity, the bishop saying, 'RECEIVE THE HOLY GHOST, for the office and work of a *priest*.'

This is not merely imposition of hands, but truly an imposition on the heads of the recipients, and is worthy of *priests*, but not of ministers of the New Testament. Accordingly they are addressed in words which applied only to Apostles, but are assumed by priests, "*whosoever sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.*"

Words false, tyrannical, and blasphemous, for should the hierarchy of England pretend to retain the sins of the meanest cottager, the Son has made him free, "*his blood cleanseth from all sins.*"

My Lord, this delusion is more palpable in the consecration of bishops, for after the mock bestowal of the Holy Ghost, the bishop elect is told to "*remember that thou stir up the GRACE OF GOD WHICH IS GIVEN THEE BY THIS IMPOSITION OF OUR HANDS.*"

Is not this the style of priestly power, assuming the office of the Apostleship, to which our blessed Redeemer consecrated only *the twelve*, together with "*his chosen vessel*" the Apostle Paul?

I know not my Lord, how far the "table of kindred and affinity" for marriages, generally appended to the Prayer Book, is to be regarded as a constituent part of it. The table appears to be the one authorized in the 99th Canon, and was the standard of appeal in the late marriage discussion; it is entitled "A Table of Kindred and Affinity, wherein whosoever are related, are forbidden in Scripture and in our laws to marry together."

The first of these restrictions seems in no danger of being violated—"a man may not marry his *grandmother*." This, one would think might be left to men's taste and discretion; for to most persons a marriage of this kind would be as "distasteful" as it was to the Right Rev. Prelate, the Bishop of Norwich, "to turn their lordships' House into an arena for Biblical criticism."

But my Lord, it is no more against the nature of things, or the principles of right reason, *for a man to marry his grandmother, than for the State to marry the Church.*

And whilst the Spiritual Peers, supported by this strange alliance, forbid widowers to marry the sister of a deceased wife, some are earnest in seeking to dissolve that union which places the prelates in the hall of legislation.

There are some my Lord who regard this last prominent act of legislation by our Spiritual Peers, as a part of that obstructive policy, by which burdens are continued. A feeling of this kind has prompted one of my acquaintance to pen the following sonnet, which is here offered for your consideration.

Woe unto you, ye robed and mitred priests,
 Who teach for doctrines the commands of men,
 Blinding with odious sophistries the ken
 Of those who bend their minds to you, like beasts,
 In grovelling homage;—ye who love at feasts
 The topmost seats, who strive by word and pen,
 And fierce anathemas, to rule as when
 The nations worshipp'd God less than his priests!
 Oh, England! purge thy Senate-house once more,
 Of pampered hirelings, who neglect their flocks,
 To bind in legal fetters orthodox
 The sons of those who cast them out of yore:—
 Seed of the puritans arise, and free
 Your English homes from ghostly tyranny!

My Lord, we are often told of the Martyrs of the English Church, whose blood was the seed of Protestantism; yet I am disposed to conclude that *the leading spirits of the Reformation in England, would have reformed much further*: but that the prelates and politicians who first obstructed and martyred these Reformers, afterwards TOOK ADVANTAGE OF THEIR PRINCIPLES, and *by a timely concession strangled the advancing Reformation.*

Thus they who were in posts of emolument and power, finding the principles of the gospel on the advance, which would have overthrown all secular prelacy, found in the licentious caprices of Henry VIII, and their own love of lordship, a convenient occasion for *that COMPROMISE CALLED THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND*, by which the true Reformers were robbed of their glory, and their purpose defeated for some centuries.

The greatest Reformers in England, were repudiators not only of the Pope, but of Prelates and all secular authority and worldly pomp.

Such my Lord, was Wyclyffe; the leading Anti-State Churchman; who advised the State to resume all Church revenues, and denied the right of the clergy to hold such property.

Such was William Tyndale, together with his martyr-companion, John Frith: that same Tyndale who in 1526 translated the New Testament. A work which he was not allowed to do in Bishop Tonstall's house. That same Tonstall, who first got a proclamation against the Testament, next bought them all up and burnt them at Paul's Cross;—the same Tonstall who I believe afterwards (Tyndale having been murdered) pleased Henry by preaching at the Pope, and acknowledging the New Testament!

Thus, my Lord, the present dissenters are the children of the true Reformation-martyrs; whilst the prelates are the children of those who having slain these prophets, reaped the fruit of their labour in a mangled reformation which saved their places.

This Tyndale, who in 1526 translated the New Testament, and was aided by Coverdale in translating the Pentateuch, in Hamburg, in the year 1529, is described in *Fox's Martyrs* as one "who for his notable pains and travail, may well be called THE APOSTLE OF ENGLAND in this our later age."

These were the true Reformers, whose work was stopped by politicians and prelates, who concocted a smaller or national Popedom.

But our great Reformers, recognized neither prelacy nor State-churchism. William Tyndale in his "Practice of Prelates," observes, that the Apostles obeying Jesus Christ ordained in his kingdom and congregation [Church] two OFFICERS, one, called after the Greek word, bishop, in English, overseer," who "fed Christ's flock, and tended them only, without looking to any other business in the world. Another officer they chose, and called him deacon after the Greek; a minister in English, to minister the alms of the people to the poor and needy."

But when the Church grew rich, he observes that "the bishops made them substitutes under them, to help them, which they called priest, and kept the name of bishop unto themselves."

This was not the original bishop, who was a minister over a congregation, not over other ministers: and of modern bishops, or prelacy, Tyndale asserts,—"as thou canst heal no disease, except thou begin at the root: even so canst thou preach against no mischief, except thou begin at the bishops." (Obedience of a Christian Man.)

And that this great champion of reformation in England, did not mean merely Popish bishops, but any who might take a similar position, is plain from his whole works. On CONFIRMATION he writes, "if confirmation have a promise, [is commanded and blessed in the word of God,] then it justifieth as far as the promise extendeth.

If it have no promise, *then it is not of God*, AS THE BISHOPS BE NOT [of God.]

The Apostles and ministers of God, preach God's word; and *God's signs or sacraments* signify God's word also; *contrariwise Anti-Christ's bishops preach not*, and their sacraments speak not, but as

the disguised bishop's mum ; so are their superstitious sacraments dumb. After the bishops had left preaching, *then feigned they this dumb ceremony of confirmation*, to have somewhat at the leastway, whereby they might reign over their dioceses. They reserved also unto themselves the christening of bells, and *CONJURING or hallowing of churches and churchyards, &c.* Which confirmation and other conjurations, they have now committed to their suffragans ; because they themselves have no leisure to minister such things, for their lusts and pleasures, and abundance of all things, and for the *cumbrance that they have in the king's matters and business of the realm.*

One keepeth the privy seal, &c. &c., another sort [is] of the *king's secret council.*

WOE IS UNTO THE REALM WHERE THEY ARE OF THE COUNCIL ; as profitable are they, verily, as the wolves unto the sheep ; or the foxes unto the geese."

These will no doubt appear extreme and angry words, but they are the words of the noblest and most useful English Reformer, who brought the Scriptures into the tongue of the people. We are not apt to blame such words, when uttered against Popery, yet we see what these men accounted Popery or Anti-Christ, namely much that is retained still. For to retain the corruptions of the Church, the hierarchy sacrificed the Pope only, not Popery.

This man, my Lord, was mighty in the Scriptures, a great lover of pure and undefiled religion, and therefore that his words against a secular prelacy, may not stand even on so great an authority as his own name merely, the following argument from the beginning of his Practice of Prelates, may suffice to justify consideration on the part of your Lordship, and those who uphold the marriage of the Church with the State.

"Prelates, appointed to preach Christ, may not leave God's word, and minister temporal offices ; but ought to teach the lay people the right way, and let them alone with all temporal business.

Our Saviour Jesus Christ answered Pilate, (John xviii.) that his kingdom was not of this world. And in Matt. x. he saith, the disciple is not greater than his master is. Wherefore, if Christ's kingdom be not of this world, nor any of *his disciples may be otherwise than he was, then Christ's vicars, which minister his kingdom here in his bodily absence, and have the oversight of his flock, may be none emperors, kings, dukes, lords, knights, temporal judges, or any temporal officer, or under false names have any such dominion, or minister any such office as requieth violence.*

And (Matt. vi.) no man can serve two masters ; where Christ concludeth saying ; ye cannot serve God and mammon ;—that is riches, covetousness, ambition, and temporal dignities.

And (Matt. xx.) Christ called his disciples unto him, and said : ye know that the lords of the heathen people, have dominion over them ; and they that be great do exercise power over them.

Howbeit, it shall not be so among you ; but whosoever will be great among you shall be your minister ; and he that will be chief shall be your servant ; even as the Son of man came not that men should minister unto him, but for to minister, and give his life for the redemption of

many. Wherefore the officers in Christ's kingdom may have no temporal dominion or jurisdiction, nor execute any temporal authority or law of violence, nor may have any like manner among them. But clean contrary: they must cast themselves down under all, and become servants unto all, suffer of all, and bear the burthen of every man's infirmities, and go before them, and fight for them against the world with the sword of God's word, even unto the death, after the ensample of Christ.

And (Matt. xviii.) when the disciples asked who should be greatest in the kingdom of heaven, Christ called a young child unto him, and set him in the midst among them, saying: except ye turn back and become as children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Now young children bear no rule one over another, but all is fellowship among them. And he said moreover, whosoever humbleth himself after the ensample of this child, he is greatest in the kingdom of heaven; that is, to be (as concerning ambition and worldly desire) so childish, that thou couldst not heave thyself above thy brother, is the very bearing of rule, and to be great in Christ's kingdom. And to describe the very fashion of the greatness of his kingdom, he said, he that receiveth one such child in my name, receiveth me. What is that to receive a child in Christ's name? Verily, to submit, to meek, and humble thyself, and to cast thyself under all men; and to consider all men's infirmities and weaknesses: and to help to heal their diseases with the word of truth, and to live purely, that they see no contrary ensample in thee, to whatsoever thou teachest them in Christ; that thou put no stumbling block before them, to make them fall while they be yet young and weak in the faith; but that thou abstain as Paul teacheth, (1 Thess. v.) from all that might seem evil or whereof a man might surmise amiss; and that thou so love them, that whatsoever gift of God in thee is, thou think the same theirs, and their food, and for their sakes given unto thee as the truth is, and that all their infirmities be thine, and that thou feel them, and that thine heart mourn for them; and that with all thy power thou help to amend them, and cease not to cry to God for them, neither day, nor night; and that thou let nothing be found in thee, that any man may rebuke, but whatsoever thou teachest them, that be thou; and that thou be not a wolf in a lamb's skin, as our holy father the Pope is, which cometh unto us in a name of hypocrisy, and in the title of cursed Cham, or Ham, calling himself *Servus Servorum*, the servant of all servants, and is yet found tyrannus tyrannorum, of all tyrants the most cruel. This is to receive young children in Christ's name and to bear rule in the kingdom of Christ.

Thus ye see, that Christ's kingdom is altogether spiritual, and the bearing of rule in it, is clean contrary unto the bearing of rule temporally. Wherefore none that beareth rule in it may have any temporal jurisdiction, or minister any temporal office that requireth violence to compel withal."

If these observations be true my Lord, and if God's law is our only rule, then a Bill of Divorcement to separate the Church from the State, and free bishops from temporal engagements, should once more render "their lordships' House the arena of Biblical criticism."

"It is no slight advantage in a matter where so many interests are involved" to have this question settled by an authority above us.

It behoves your Lordship therefore, according to your consecration vows, to "banish and drive away all erroneous and strange *doctrine contrary to God's word*;"—to "faithfully exercise yourself in the same Holy Scriptures,—so as you may be able by them to teach and exhort;" to "think upon the things contained in **THIS BOOK**"* and finding it different to the Prayer Book, and to that system of secular spiritual lordship amidst which you have not forgotten the nature of real Christianity, to perform the necessary duty of obeying God's word alone.

The rule is your own adoption, let it then be carried out; for as is recorded of your Lordship's speech on the Marriage Bill "the part of the Legislature, must not be to lower the law to the standard of practice, but to elevate the practice to the standard of the law." In this matter, it is the divine law alone, by which we are to be ruled. To this we must elevate our practice.

No considerations of *expediency* will be urged by your Lordship for the continuance of this anomalous alliance, for as is recorded in the same speech, "*reference to expediency, supposed the absence of acknowledged principles* or settled law. When principle began, the provision of expediency was at an end: and he (the Archbishop of Canterbury) held that in the present case they were bound by a settled principle and divine law, and *could allow of no other consideration*."

Then, my Lord, let this sole consideration have its full weight in reconsidering the *Ecclesiastical Marriage Bill*, legalizing the union of the Church and the world. The same rule should be applied in any future *Ecclesiastical Titles Bill*, where we should have pointed out to us not only "bishops, priests, and deacons," sanctioned by the Scriptures, but *such* bishoprics, priesthoods, and deaconships as are now assumed.

Together with the many other orders, not pretended to be founded on the divine law, as "*Dean of Arches*, and other *Judge of the said Archbishop's Court*, Guardians of Spiritualities, Chancellors, *Deans and Chapters: Archdeacons*, Commissaries, officials, Registrars, and all and every other ecclesiastical officers."

Let such names and orders be measured by the Apostolical constitutions, as "Prebendaries, Canons, Vicars, Petty Canons, Singing-men;" Major Canons, "Masters and Heads of Cathedral Churches," Churchwardens, Side-men, "Presidents and Residentiaries of Cathedral Churches," Ordinaries, Vicars, Curates, Rural Deans, Suffragans, Apparitor of the Archbishop's Prerogative Court; Surrogate, Preceptor, and all the other appendages of ecclesiastical courts and offices.

Your Lordship will perceive the same disproportion between the three orders modestly claimed by the Church of England and the thirty or forty foisted in, as there is between the simplicity of the gospel and the abuses of a secularized religion. It has not yet been explained why the "three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons," should admit of a fourth and fifth order, *arch-deacon*, *arch-bishop*, and not the sixth to complete the triple pair, **ARCH-PRIEST**.

* The Bible presented to a bishop at his consecration; when the above words are uttered.

Consider, my Lord, not only the opposition between the gospel and this alliance with the world, but also the equality of Christians as brethren under one master, compared with the usual titles of our prelates, every one of whom is a "LORD Bishop" by courtesy and right of office.

Are these the terms Christ intended to sanction, when he said—"they that are accounted to rule among the Gentiles exercise LORDSHIP over them, and their *great ones* exercise authority upon them. *But it shall not be so among you.* Whosoever will be chiefest, shall be servant of all."—(Mark x. 42—44.)

This description of *Christian dignitaries*, may perhaps appear mean, as compared with a Lord Archbishop, Most Rev. Father in God, two large titles and two fine palaces.

But interest and expediency we have agreed are to yield to the settled law of the Redeemer's kingdom.

The modest and judicious Hooker thus addressed the Archbishop of Canterbury, in his day ;—

TO THE
MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,
MY VERY GOOD LORD,
THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,
HIS GRACE
PRIMATE AND METROPOLITAN OF ALL ENGLAND.

Allow me to conclude this appeal to your Lordship, in the words of the same writer—"humbly beseeching your Grace to pardon my great boldness,

Your Grace's in all duty,"
AN ADMIRER OF THE ENGLISH REFORMERS.

P.S. Your Grace may find some principles to guide in the formation of an *Ecclesiastical Titles Bill*, in the following observations extracted from a Letter by Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the reign of Henry VIII. It is printed in Bishop Burnet's Collection of Records, vol. iii. History of the Reformation in England, "*by the Right Reverend Father in God, Gilbert, LORD BISHOP of Sarum.*"

"Cranmer's Letter to Cromwell; justifying himself, upon some complaints made by Gardiner.

Right Worshipful, in my moste hartie wise I commend me unto you, most hartely thanking you, for that you have signified unto me by my Chapleyne, Master Champion, the Complaynte of the Bishope of Winchester unto the King's Highness, in two Thyngs concernyng my Visitation. The one is, that in my Style, I am written, *Totius Angliæ Primas*, [Primate of all England,] to the Derogation and Prejudice of the King's Highe Power and Authoritie, beyng Supreme Hedde of the Church.

Firste, as concernyng my Stile, wherein I am named *Totius Angliæ Primas*. I suppose, that *to make his Cause good*, (which els indede were nawghte) *he doth myxe it with the King's Cause*, (as ye knowe

the man lacketh, neither Lernyng in the Lawe, neither witty Invention, the Crafte to sett furth his Matters to the best,) that he myght appere not to maynteyn his own Cause, but the Kyng's. But to be plain, *I cannot think the Bishop of Winchester so MUCH TENDERETH THE KING'S CAUSE AS HE DOTHE HIS OWN.*

I doubt not, but all the Bishops of England, would ever gladly have hadd the Archbishop's both Authoritie and the Title taken away, that they myght have byn equall to gether; which well apperith by the many contentions agaynst the Archbishops for Jurisdiction in the Courte of Rome; which had been easily brought to pass if the Bishops of Rome had thought the Archbishops Titles and Stiles to be any Derrogation to their Supreme Authoritie. All this notwithstanding, yf the Bishops of this Realme passe no more of their Names, Stiles, and Titles, than I do of myn; the Kyng's Highnes shall sone order the Matter between us all. And if I saw that my Stile were against the Kyng's Authoritie, (whereunto I am specially sworne,) I would sew my self unto His Grace, that I might leave it; and so wolde have don before this Tyme. For, I pray God never be mercyful unto me at the Generall Judgement, if I perceyve in my Hert, that I sett more by any Title, Name, or Stile that I write, than I do by the Paring of an Apple, *farther than it shall be to the setting furthe of God's Worde and Will.* Yet I will not utterly excuse me herein, for God must be Judge, who knoweth the Botome of my Harte, for many evill Affections lye lurkyng ther, and will not lightly be espied. But yet I would not gladly leave any Juste Thyng, at the Pleasure and sute of the Bishop of Winchester, he beyng none otherwise affectionate unto me than he is. Even at the Beginning furst of Christ Profession, Diotrephes desired *gerere Primatum in Ecclesia* as saith St. John in his last Epistell. And sayns, [since then,] *he had more Successours than all the Apostles hadd, of whom have come all theis Glorious Titles, Stiles, and Pompes into the Church.* But I would, that I, and all my Brethren the Bishops, would leave all our Stiles, and write the Stile of our Offices, callyng our selves *Apostlos Jesu Christi* [Apostles of Jesus Christ:] so that we take not upon us the Name vaynly, but *were so even indede*; so that we might order our Dioces in suche Sorte, that neither Paper, Parchmente, Leade, nor Wexe, but the very Christian Conversation of the people myght be the Letters and Seales of our Offices, as the Corinthians were unto Paule, to whom he said, *Litterae nostrae et Signa Apostolatûs nostri vos estis.*" [Ye are our letters, and proofs of our Apostleship.]"

IV.

SCEPTICS' RELIGION.

Under this department, sceptical objections, and systems or principles advocated as hostile to Christianity, are dispassionately considered.

INFIDEL TACTICS.

[*To the Editor of the Bible and the People.*]

DEAR SIR,

You were kind enough to observe respecting a former communication, that you would be glad to hear from me again, and this emboldens me to trouble your readers with a few further observations.

Your department on sceptics' religion will do good service, if it should even do nothing more than direct men to the true question at issue,—*the Bible itself, and not the mistakes and prejudices* either of believers or infidels.

While Bibles are so common and so cheap, every man may possess a copy, and those who write against it, should first read it; and if they quote, should quote fairly. For instance, to quote *vengeance is mine*, as a reason for *human revenge*; is as good as the old method,—“Judas went and hanged himself,” “go and do thou likewise.”

I shall perhaps be pardoned for observing that the article on “Infidel's Candour and Knowledge of the Scriptures,” might have been extended to advantage, though perhaps it was thought sufficient to point out a few palpable contradictions, and leave the reader to pursue the enquiry for himself.

One point of information respecting the Paper there commented on was omitted, namely, that whilst not written by the editor of the Sceptical periodical in which it appeared, it was endorsed by a note of the editor's; in which another instance of the same kind was adduced.

The *tactics* of some sceptical writers, (as distinguished from those doubters who are honestly groping after the truth, as a final resting place,) appears to be not only to misapply and quote the Scriptures partially, but also to ridicule distorted theories professedly founded on the Scriptures, as if these were Christianity itself. Further, they seem apt to overlook not only the self-commending principles of the gospel, but the most powerful defences of it, whilst they fasten with great glee upon any instances where zeal overleaps discretion.

Nor are they anxious to engage with any of those lighter antagonists who meet them in the congenial contest,—the encounter of wit, relieving the dullness of logic.

This though their own favourite method, (in which they are inclined to mistake rallery for argument, and burlesque for smartness) they regard as their own monopoly: and seem to think it unbecoming in serious people to answer them in their own style. Hence any casual expression (having no relation to the argument) becomes a reason for declining the contest which they provoke.

A periodical devoted to Atheism has favoured my former communication "The Atheist's Box," with a slight notice, on which I beg to make a few observations.

The editor of this periodical formerly declared "that through many weary weeks he had looked for 'The Bible and the People,' and now that December had set in, he was unable to remain in silent suspense."

Being somewhat curious I watched for his first notice of your efforts, which is as follows:—

"The '*suspense*' to which we alluded some time ago has been put an end to by the appearance of the *Bible and the People*. We should not have been aware of the existence of this work, had not a friend in Market Harborough written and apprised us of it. One department is entitled the 'Sceptics' Religion,' under which head, we presume, no notice of the *Reasoner* will find a place, as we do not profess to have any religion. The first article is the examination of a Paper which has appeared in the *Freethinkers' Magazine*, to which we are not called upon to reply. The writer of the article in question is a theist, who takes a view of Christians and Christianity such as we have never been able to take. The second article is a letter from a correspondent, who talks in a very ambiguous way of two freethinking publications, one of which he designates the 'elder brother,' by which title is probably meant the *Reasoner*. Quoting some words from our 'Appeal,' the writer says 'we little thought what was coming.' What has come, however, is very like what we expected; and, if all yet to come is of the same quality, it will not require any attention from us. The writer, under the name of John Knox, retails the accusation brought against us a few weeks ago—namely, that we 'slandered' Mr. Baines by representing him as denying public knowledge; and, although we have answered this imputation, the editor of the *Bible and the People* repeats the charge, and intimates, in allusion to us, that 'some writers can succeed best either in *misrepresenting* the cause, or *slandering* the characters of those they should refute.' We shall wait to see whether this is to be the fashion in which the *Bible and the People* proposes to controvert our views. If so, we shall consider it not at all a matter of necessity to reply.

A year ago, at Aliquis's request, we forwarded to the Rev. Brewin Grant, an article upon the Design Argument. This article Mr. Knox, a correspondent of the *Bible and the People*, quotes, and appends to it what is intended as a reply. When Aliquis returns to England, he will probably write to Mr. Knox upon the subject.

G. J. H."

We may perceive by this what sort of 'suspense' it was, by which this gentleman was enabled to learn the existence of *The Bible and the People*, not through enquiring at the booksellers, but from the accidental intimation of a correspondent.

And also how readily he satisfies his correspondents that "we shall not consider it at all a matter of necessity to reply." During the state of "suspense," he enquired anxiously, "May we hope to see No. I?" And then waited for it to come to him.

It is pleasant to find these gentlemen so sensitive as to any reproofs administered to themselves, since it may lead them to be more considerate in imputations against others.

There is nothing improper in bringing a *true* accusation, by way of reproving the unfairness of a public writer. But it seems to be quite an innocent observation, on the part of this editor to call an active enlightener of the people one who "*denies them public knowledge*:" and to make his "patronage of a publication for the people, a *rich joke*." This is the same kind of *candour* respecting men's character, as this class of writers displays respecting the Scriptures.

To call this a slander or misrepresentation, affords a sufficient apology for our rich joker to decline argument; especially since he "had answered the imputation," *though he had not withdrawn it*. His answer to the imputation of having misrepresented or slandered the gentleman referred to, is curious in its way and justifies the repetition of the charge.

In the answer our editor still notices "the *inconsistent position* in which we found Mr. Baines put," (viz.: as a friend to The Bible and the People!) "he is no doubt an able and conscientious man, but nevertheless we regard him as an *imperfect friend* of national education."

What "an imperfect friend" may be intended for, whether an enemy or not, is doubtful; but the gentleman in question is a known opponent of national education, or any education by government, or by taxes; is he therefore one who "*denies public knowledge to the people*?"

This is the point of the "rich joke," which is still a rich misrepresentation.

There is nothing "*inconsistent*" in those who deny government education, endeavouring to support voluntary education by newspapers, periodicals, and schools; and to represent these as opposed to the instruction of the people, is nothing less than a slander.

Now because this is reproved, they who are guilty of it, are not in the position to retire from argument on another question.

The best defence of your contemporary, is in the apology he makes,—that his references occurred in a "*half-laughing notice*;" how these gentlemen manage when they *quite* laugh, is a mystery; but surely their readers should have some notification as to how far the writers are serious; and I would suggest, that in *anticipating* any answer to their views, the heading should be "half-laughing notices," whilst in *replying* to objections, they should give warning that it is a "half-crying notice."

But your contemporary is also troubled with a very short memory, for in the same notice in which he declares that he was "not aware of the existence of The Bible and the People," except through a correspondent, he refers to his defence against imputations, in which he *had already said*, "The Bible and the People is now before the public." Whilst in referring to an examination of an article from his paper, he supposes that no notice will be taken of the said paper.

These are minor matters in themselves, but may be of some use in

leading the readers of such *half-laughing* periodicals to become *half-suspecting*, and to enquire a little farther after what the editor may "not consider it a matter of necessity to reply" to.

This suggests to me two grand fallacies, which the editors of sceptical publications are apt to put upon their readers, directly or indirectly.

The first is, that any course of argument, accompanied by observations not quite suitable to their taste, may be fairly passed by on that account.

The second is, *that any arguments in favour of Christianity may be left out of the reckoning, except such as are directly in reply to objections advanced by the periodicals they preside over.*

By this means, these public teachers evade the great question of the evidence of Christianity, and look only to their own objections and any answers to them which may be agreeable. So that should any persons unfortunately read only such periodicals, they come under a kind of Sceptical Popedom, for by a true *Index Expurgatorius* those points are left out on which Christian advocates rest their cause; whilst objections are paraded *where proofs are not allowed.*

Or at least if *allowed* from an occasional zealous correspondent suitable to the purpose, *these proofs are not sought* from the vast and varied repositories of learning and argument, by which religion is defended, in addition to its own native lustre.

There are not many jurors or judges, who would be satisfied with this way of debate;—listening to an advocate's objections to the other side, without hearing the evidence and arguments he professes to overthrow.

Nor would it be considered a sufficient settlement of any cause, to say that certain objections of the advocate had not been removed,—providing abundant proofs from other sources, had been advanced to counterbalance all minor difficulties.

It is a plain and simple rule, that we should hear both sides, and therefore *the infidel press ought to furnish us with the best defences of Christianity*, before it can fairly advance any objections, otherwise the contest is with a man of straw. The opposite to this rule, appears to be the practice of your contemporary, since he looks *only to the sceptical department* of "The Bible and the People," instead of attending also to the department on Christ's Religion, wherein the true nature and evidences of the gospel are set forth, as for instance, the historical evidence involved in "The Inscription on the Cross;" and the removal of objections to professed forms of religion in the other departments, by shewing that many things having the name of Christianity, are the traditions of men, overlaying the simplicity of Christ. All these matters are passed by, the editors having only to do with answers to their own speculations. Should the gospel be vindicated against other forms of infidelity, they "are not called upon to reply," however similar the modes of attack may be.

And should each in turn be refuted, one has no concern in answers to another, whilst each may evade noticing a refutation of himself, on the ground that whilst his views have been controverted, his misrepresentations of individuals have also been exposed. They may then "wait to see whether this is the fashion" in which they are to be answered.

It would be easy indeed to find revilings wholesale and retail, without any proof but assertion, in many of their writings, so as to afford us a better

reason for declining to answer; but they it seems must not even be open to just rebuke. Besides, these methods of evading the real question at issue, these writers are found to be *reiterating objections that have been fully answered*, without recording the answers: which may result from the modern way of being original, namely, by inventing what was invented and discarded long ago. I have seen a book advertised to prove that this earth is a plain and not a globe; I dare say the writer has not had time to study modern astronomy. And if any one should prove by mathematical demonstration that the earth is a sphere, revolving round the sun, he will be ready to reply, that *his objections are not answered*.

It is very possible there may be some shrewd objections to the circulation of the blood; but I suppose these are *answered by proofs of the fact*; whilst if any should have reached so far as to see only the difficulties in this theory, it might be found on examination that they have not waited to understand what they oppose; but imagine with the mythological student, that according to Harvey, the blood circulates down one leg and up the other, against which there are no doubt fatal and obvious objections. At any rate it seems plain, that many difficulties are seen by those who are only beginning, and have not gone far enough to see the explanations. A countryman has the evidence of his senses that the sun goes round the earth, and can afford to laugh at astronomers—because his ignorance keeps him in countenance.

The improver or even the subverter of any science, must first have mastered it; they who have not attained to this position of privilege, should imitate the delicate modesty of the Cambridge Gownsmen, who when examined in theology, declined to decide which were the minor prophets, since these distinctions were invidious.

I know not whether any modern genius has attained to the ancient theory that the firmament is made of glass; perhaps by the time such a person had travelled from Aristotle and the early fathers to the days of Queen Victoria, he would discover his mistake; but should he boldly attack the later knowledge men have attained to, he would be reminded that they who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

The originality which disdains the helps and information accumulated by the leading spirits of the world, and goes forth to make discoveries without the charts and maps of settled enquiries, appears to me (as a plain man) to be only spiritual knight errantry or romance.

But whilst many of your sceptical contemporaries seem thus to treat the great question of the gospel and its evidences, they expect a different line of conduct in return. I remember the observation of one editor, that after his *nine volumes* we ought to be well acquainted with his views.

We are all called upon diligently to study all they have written. Thus for instance, we read in one of these periodicals,—“if ‘An Admirer of Truth’ is really anxious to learn what *reasons* atheists have for their opinions, behold they are abundantly manifest in the books, &c. which he might borrow if he cannot purchase them, of many friends in London, provided he takes the trouble to find them out; they will *hardly come like roast pigs to saints*, ‘crying come and read me.’ If he were here he should willingly have mine.”

This is but a fair requirement, and the offer to lend is charitable. I

hope you will imitate this charity, and send some of those writers a Bible, with the divisions of chapter and verse, that they may find out what *reasons* the Mannings discovered for murdering O'Connor.

There is one point however which I cannot understand,—the roast pigs: is it then a part of your religion that roast pigs *come* to saints? In my country, these animals are *carried* after having been roasted; and they are never known to “cry” at all, having once gone through that fiery operation.

Charles Lamb's Essay on roast pig is out-done in this imaginative flight; I think that celebrated wit would have roasted some others, and would mightily have enjoyed the crackling.

But the cry of these cooked animals is equally inexplicable, “come and read me!” I should see him carved first: perhaps however this sentence was uttered by one of those “learned pigs,” of whom shewmen tell us; whose literature is so ingrained that they mistake themselves for books, and cry, (after being roasted,)—“come and read me!”

This is perhaps the origin of that intellectual repast, called “the feast of reason and the flow of soul.” Nor will any one who understands the origin of these instructive animals, wonder at their literary character; they are born a litter, live in one, and are carried on one to be singed, as a prelude to roasting, and preparation for that swan-like dirge “come and read me.”

The editor of the periodical in which this pathetic appeal is recorded, seems to have joined the saints, and like them to stay for an invitation; since whilst waiting in anxious “suspense” for “The Bible and the People,” two months pass over, in which “he did not take the trouble” to find it out, but was enlightened by a voice from the provinces announcing the rich repast.

And now he promises that Aliquis, (whose Atheistical arguments were sent round as a challenge to ministers,) “will probably write to Mr. Knox on the subject,” “when he returns to England.” My friend Aliquis then seems to be quite an erratic comet, visiting this sphere only occasionally, sweeping his portentous tail through the theological heaven, scattering desolation and war upon parsons, and then retiring beyond the reach of the Post, so that he cannot write till he returns to England. What he may be doing in his absence, has been the subject of speculation amongst some of my friends, who have suggested various occupations, as some say, he is making another box; others, that he is counting his chickens before they are hatched: whilst others, more wisely suggest, that he is framing an argument to the effect that there is *no* (design or) reason in roasting eggs: and therefore none in hatching them. But we shall hear when he returns to England.

Your's sincerely,
JOHN KNOX.

V.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN NATURE.

The Nature of Man as Spiritual, Immortal, and Responsible, will be the most frequent topic of this department: though sometimes we shall introduce MISCELLANEOUS Subjects.

THE NATURE OF FAITH AND SCIENCE.

Newtown, January 4th, 1851.

[To the Editor of *The Bible and the People*.]

MY DEAR SIR,

I have read the first number of "The Bible and the People" with considerable pleasure. I think that the mode of treatment adopted, is one that is suitable to the exigencies of the age, and if fully carried out, it will not fail to render service to the cause of religious truth. I do not, however, concur in some of the statements made in the first and fifth articles; and understanding that you war against the doctrine of human infallibility, and that you invite controversy, properly conducted, I venture to make some observations on the articles mentioned.

The first point in the first article, to which I will refer is, that which represents faith as identical with reason.

I once thought, as you do, that faith does not differ from a moral judgment, and that the difference between the nominal believer and the real one consists, not in the nature of the mental operations called faith, but in the things believed:—the latter believing the true, spiritual meaning of the gospel, the former a meaning of his own; but I have seen reason to change this opinion, and to adopt the one propounded, I believe, by Coleridge, which represents faith as the concurrence of the will, with the conclusions of the understanding.

The appeal, on this point, I think is to our own consciousness. The Scriptures no more teach mental science than they do astronomy or geology, though doubtless the characteristics which they ascribe to faith, would indicate the part of our nature where we are to seek for it. Now, in looking at the process of my own mind in reference to the gospel, and in observing the manifestations of similar processes in the minds of others, it seems to me that there is something more than a mere mental perception of that gospel involved in faith.

Let us attempt to analyze the operation.

In your prospectus* you represented, correctly I think, the Atonement of Christ as the central truth of the gospel; consequently, he who believes that truth, believes the essence of the gospel. Now, the Atonement

* The original Prospectus of THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE.

ment is an event in the providence of God designed and adapted to become the ground on which God would bestow pardon, justification and everlasting life. The representation of this event, along with its design and utility in the Scriptures, constitutes the *doctrine* of the Atonement.

If faith be identical with reason, all the mind has to do is to apprehend this doctrine.

You say, "by faith then our Lord meant perception, insight, or understanding of his spiritual meaning." I suppose you would admit that this spiritual perception must have reference to the gospel, as it is in itself, and as it is in its relations, as a gospel of truth. It is possible to have a correct and clear apprehension of the gospel, as revealed in the Bible, though it were a system of falsehood. We may have a clear conception of the doctrine of the Atonement, without that conception involving the reality and truthfulness of the event out of which it arose. The Atonement is not a necessary truth, bearing its own evidences, but it has sprung from the gracious arrangements of God; and therefore, it must depend for the evidence of its truth upon something extrinsic: if so, there is something more than an insight of its meaning necessary: that is, the mind must judge, must compare it with something out of itself.

Here, then, are two processes, apprehension and judgment—the one gazing upon the doctrine itself, the other comparing it with something without. I suppose you to comprehend, in spiritual perception these two processes, and only these, and that when an individual has these, he has faith—the faith that saves.

Now it seems to me, that an individual may have these two states of mind, and yet reject the gospel. He may be convinced that Christ has made provision for his salvation, and yet disapprove of that provision. He may perceive the fitness of the gospel to his condition, and yet refuse to submit his mind to the full influence of that gospel. Accordingly, I think that faith is the concurrence of the will—the controlling faculty of the mind, with the conclusions of the understanding. It is the will bringing the mind, in humble submission, to the arrangements of God, placing it under the full influence of his truth, so that this truth becomes an internal, settled principle of the mind.

I think that you have succeeded in showing that faith is not *opposed* to reason, but this is not proving that it is not *different* from reason. You will of course admit, that one thing may not be opposed to another, and yet may be different from it. Most of the quotations and references in your article appear to me to establish the non-opposition of faith and reason, and the union of the two in the mind's perfect contact with truth, but the identity of the two does not appear to be made out.

According to the representation of faith, which I have given, reason must be exercised—and without its exercise, faith would be impossible. There may however be the one without the other. I have reason to believe, that there are many wicked men who have clearer conceptions of the doctrines of the gospel, than many poor and illiterate, yet pious Christians. The former do not submit to the truth apprehended, the latter feel the power of what they know. I think, that progress in faith, implies progress in knowledge; but I should hesitate in asserting, that progress in knowledge, implies progress in faith.

I would direct your attention also to a statement made in page 7. "The *inherent* truthfulness of Christ's religion being thus recognized, we learn that to teach it is to prove it; for indeed nothing else can prove Christianity but itself; miracles and historical evidences may be useful auxiliaries," et cetera. I believe, with you, that Christianity harmonizes with the nature and condition of the human mind, to use your own language, that it "fills up the vacancies of the human soul," and that from this harmony may be derived the most important and the most extensively applicable *inference* of the truth of Christianity; but you will doubtless admit that to represent Christ's religion as inherently true on account of this harmony, is to lose sight of the distinction between necessary and contingent truth. That which is inherently true is so independently of everything else, and necessitates belief; it does not require and will not admit of any evidence from without. Hence, if Christianity were "*inherently true*," it would be so independently of every external testimony, and even independently of its adaptation to the nature and condition of the human mind—it would command belief before the comparison between it and man's condition could be made.

By placing Christianity in the class of necessary truths, there is danger of destroying its historical character, of denying its objective existence, and ultimately of referring it entirely to a subjective origin, the consequence of which would be the annihilation of all positive religion in the world. Perhaps nothing more was meant by the phrase "*inherent truthfulness*," than the evidence arising from the consideration of the gospel's fitness to man, but the language is evidently incorrect, and would render the writer liable to misinterpretation, especially when taken in connection with the depreciation of the evidences of miracles and history.

I have now done with the first article, and ask your indulgence in making an observation or two upon the fifth.

I fully concur with you in the propriety of confining every branch of human knowledge within its own province, and thereby preventing one from going out of its way to predicate falsehood of another. I fully think that to maintain, as I heard a minister lately doing, that there is more true natural philosophy, geology, physiology and metaphysics, in the Bible than anywhere else, is to make the revelation of God to man an object of ridicule to the philosophical sceptic, and its truthfulness to depend upon the progress of human discovery in departments foreign to its nature and scope.

Convinced of this, I think that it is a good plan of your Magazine to mark out the boundaries of the several provinces of human inquiry; but it seems to me that the *principle* of division which you have adopted is not a logical one. You divide all knowledge into physics, metaphysics, and divinity. I suppose that you include under metaphysics what the ancient schools of philosophy marked out as a separate division under the designation of dialectics; and that divinity is only another name for ethics, the science of moral relations—though I think that divinity is not so comprehensive as ethics, because it relates more to the relations and duties subsisting between the Creator and his creatures, than to those which exist between creatures themselves; both of which are equally

included under the term ethics. But the illogical principle of division is indicated in the explanatory terms which are substituted for physics, metaphysics, and divinity, viz., science, philosophy, and theology.

It seems to me that there is a cross division here, if the terms science and philosophy have anything like their usual acceptations. These terms, I admit, are not accurately defined in the generality of works, especially the latter; at the same time, am not aware that they have ever been used in the sense which you attach to them. According to your principle of division, there can be no science in metaphysics, and no philosophy in physics. Now it seems to me, that the contrary of this is the case, and that philosophy and science have a sphere as much in the one as in the other.

The term physics, properly designates the whole world of material existences. They thus denote two distinct regions of "subject matter," on which the faculties of the mind may be exercised.

Neither science nor philosophy is to be found in the concrete objects existing in either of these regions; but they pertain to the thinking subject. The essence of science, is classification—the arrangement into classes of the individual concrete objects which nature contains. Now this may be done with the objects of the immaterial world, as well as those of the material. That is, there may be science in metaphysics as well as in physics. Hence, what is sometimes called mental philosophy, is at other times called mental science: and what is called natural science, is sometimes called natural philosophy. The terms are not strictly convertible, but both may have their application in the same provinces.

Philosophy is a term of more ambiguous import. It is sometimes made identical with science, or to comprehend a number of sciences; but I think, that strictly speaking, it denotes that which is general, universal, and necessary in every department of human enquiry in physics, metaphysics, and divinity; at all events, this is the sense which it bears in the writings of the greatest minds of the age. Hence, there may be philosophy in physics as well as in metaphysics.

A little confusion may arise from the want of distinguishing between the objective and the subjective. If the first series of terms were intended to denote the objective, and the second the subjective, I think I have shown that they do not correspond, and that science and philosophy may be the subjective both of physics and of metaphysics.

I have only one other remark to make, closely allied to the above, and that is, on the faculties which you assign to science and philosophy, respectively.

"Science," you say, "is the observation and orderly arrangement of material changes—a *matter chiefly of the senses and memory*: philosophy regards the nature of man, and the wisdom exhibited in the arrangements of nature discovered by science—exclusively a matter of reflection and reasoning."

Now memory has reference only to what has once been in the mind, whether it has been there in an orderly or disorderly form; hence, the only faculties which you assign as having to do directly with science, are the senses. The senses have two provinces—that of sensation, which is subjective: and that of perception, which is objective. Neither of these

nor both appear to me to be adequate to the construction of science. Natural science is not the classification of our sensations, and therefore, sensation cannot supply natural science. Sense-perception has to do immediately with the concrete objects of the material world; but it has to do with them simply as individuals. The relations which these individuals sustain to each other, and the laws which prevail amongst them, can be discovered only by a higher faculty than perception. Relations and laws are not distinct entities, and therefore they cannot come under the cognizance of perception which has to do exclusively with real existing material substances. If two objects, sustaining several relations to each other, were presented before the perceptive faculty, this faculty would cognize them as distinct objects: but it could not apprehend the relations existing between them. It is frequently the case, that an object which produces effects cognizable by the perceptive faculty, has never *itself* come under the notice of this faculty, much less its causal relation: so that the existence of the *causal object* is a matter of *inference* not of perception. We might notice electricity. The fluid itself has never been observed by the senses, but its effects have. It is impossible to get the idea of causation by the senses.

We confidently affirm its existence in regions that have never come under the cognizance of the senses. Whether it is to be referred to the logical or intuitional faculty, is a matter of controversy; but it is certain that it cannot be referred to the senses.

According to your explanations, "science has to do with the discovery of the orderly series of changes in material things: these changes in their observed order constituting the laws of nature, or methods and processes in physical objects;" consequently, science is not chiefly a matter of the senses and memory. It requires the employment of the highest faculties of the understanding. Whatever faculties are necessary to carry on the reasoning process, are employed in the construction of science. I do not know any faculty that is employed in the province of metaphysics, that is not equally required in that of physics, though the senses are employed in physics, and not in metaphysics.

I hope that you will not deem me impertinent in venturing to make these remarks. If it can be shown that I am in error, I shall be glad of the correction.

I am,

Your's truly,

JOHN EVANS.

[N.B. The writers of the articles referred to, "Christianity a reasonable Religion," and "the Provinces of Philosophy, Religion and Science," will reply in our next. Meanwhile we beg our readers to re-peruse the papers in question, and exercise their own judgment. We invite discussion, especially as conducted in the spirit and with the ability of our correspondent.—EDITOR.]

THE UTILITY OF MENTAL PHILOSOPHY.

PHILOSOPHY, in the strict and highest sense, is the study of universal and fundamental principles: those primary truths which extend to all branches of knowledge; and constitute our principles of belief, or laws of thought in the acquisition of knowledge, and grounds of obligation in the fulfilment of duty. And this explains why philosophy deals primarily with mind, and is often called mental philosophy, (sometimes metaphysics, the science of first truths, and fundamental principles,)—the reason for the name mental philosophy, being, that all knowledge is related to the instrument, on the knowing mind; and hence this science is the widest and most elevated, comprehending *general truths, in their relation to human nature.*

It is a desecration of the term philosophy, to apply it to natural science, which forms but a narrow department of knowledge; and the same desecration is perpetrated, in the ambitious name applied to some institutions,—"Philosophical Society," when they are only homœopathic imitations of the "British Association" for the advance of science.

We may here notice some objections to the utility of philosophy, in the sense now generally intimated. Including the laws of our mental constitution, and the general principles on which the sciences are constructed. There are two classes of phenomena, on which it has been observed, "the first are those which can be made the subject of experiment, where the substances are actually in our power, and the judgment and artifice of the enquirer, can be effectually employed to arrange and combine them, in such a way as to disclose their hidden properties and relations. The other class of phenomena, are those that occur in substances altogether beyond our reach, the *order and succession of which we are generally unable to control*, and as to which we can do little more than collect and record the laws by which they appear to be governed. These substances, are not the subjects of EXPERIMENT, but of OBSERVATION."—"It is evident indeed, that there is no *direct* utility, in the mere accurate observation of occurrences, which we cannot control; and that for the uses to which such observations may afterwards be applied, we are indebted, *not so much* to the observer, as to the person who discovered the application:" and "in the art of observation itself, no very great or fundamental improvement can be expected."*

This is an attempt to shew, that mind, being a subject of observation, and not of experiment, the philosophy of mind, can not advance rapidly, nor be of much service. But first, if we admit a radical distinction, between observation and experiment; experiments themselves, are of no value, without correct observation of them, and deductions from them: and though the *art* of observation may not receive much improvement in mere exercise or practice, it may receive much improvement by a *science of observation*,—laying down those principles of evidence, and methods of discovery, which constitute the Logic of the Inductive

* *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. iii.

Sciences. (As for instance, in Mill's Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive.) Secondly, though observations, may not always be directly applicable to practice; they are not of less utility; since he who next applies a principle, could not have done it, until that principle had been discovered.

Thirdly, it is a fallacy to suppose, that we gain no new power, by observing agents and laws, which we cannot control; for we can *take advantage of what is beyond our control*, and make it useful, by so adapting circumstances, as that these laws shall operate in our favour. A sailor cannot raise the wind, but the observation, that certain winds arise on certain occasions, or in certain latitudes, may enable him to take advantage of these, as the *trade winds*, which combine observation and utility.

The same may be said of those observations, which enable us to predict a storm,—to be forewarned is to be fore armed.

So the observations of weather and climate, teach the farmer, when and what to sow; he cannot control the seasons, but can take advantage of them.

And, indeed the same is true of laws of thought; *we can control no laws, but by knowing them, may use them*. We do not control the heavens, but our astronomy, is the result of observation; and the experiments in connexion therewith, have only given greater facilities of observing.

It has been further asserted, that "though our power can in no case be directly increased by observation, our knowledge may very often, be greatly extended by it. In the science of mind, however, we are inclined to suspect that this is not the case:" "all men are *practically familiar* with all the functions and qualities of their minds:" "even those laws of thought, that are not so commonly stated in words, are found to regulate the practice of those who never thought of enouncing them, in an abstract proposition." "A groom, who never heard of the association of ideas, feeds the young war-horse, to the sound of the drum; and the unphilosophical artists that tame elephants, and train dancing dogs, proceed upon the same obvious and admitted principle."

But this does not prove that the principle is clearly understood without reflection; nor that as the result of a scientific enquiry into our nature, it may not be better known and more usefully employed.

All *art precedes science*; men act upon certain principles to some extent, without being aware of their nature, or of their further application. But this is never considered an objection to a science, that shall develop more fully the nature of the principles on which the art proceeds, and by which it may be improved.

A practical mechanician would receive much advantage from the science of mechanics, a deeper study of the law of forces, and their possible application: from this many improvements arise.

A savage may exchange a skin for a knife, and thus exhibit a practical acquaintance with bartering; but will have made some advance, when civilization has taught him the higher principles and practices of commerce.

Political economy, explains principles on which all men act, and yet it is a real addition to knowledge; and though founded on observation of laws that everywhere occur, it is nevertheless useful, in pointing out where men by a course of regulations, go against these laws, and so incur

the penalty. No control attempted over the natural current of commerce, but teaching men how to act always in accordance with *laws*, which *without being controlled, help those who obey them.*

Indeed, we must not imagine that they who in fundamentals, admit certain truths, do always see their full applications: they often violate in the detail, what they admit in the gross.

Every man admits the law of appropriation or property, as applied to himself; but many require some further initiation into this "obvious and admitted principle," so far as it relates to others.

Therefore, common sense, notwithstanding it goes to a certain extent, upon the principles which found any science, may be improved and enlarged, by a more systematic view of universally admitted principles.

In speaking of the decay of mental studies, it has been said, "the principles of association in education, and the generation and consequences of habits in all periods of life, have been rendered so *clear and familiar*, as rules of *practical utility*, that few persons think it necessary to examine minutely into that fine philosophy, by which they may have been at first suggested or brought into notice."

Here then it appears, that even the doctrine of association, which it was so needless to teach the bear dancer, is by this same useless philosophy of observation, brought out clearly, and applied to the business of education. And if it can affect education, it must affect the whole circle of human advancement. Nor is mental philosophy the only subject with the results of which, many are satisfied, whilst they decry the enquiry itself.

It is further asserted, "that *all* the principles of our nature, which are capable of any useful application, have forced themselves on general observation, many years ago, and can now receive little more than technical nomenclature and description, from the best efforts of philosophy."

We have already seen, that in this empirical way, principles are known and noticed, but very imperfectly: and require a scientific treatment, for further development and use. And even this additional objection, that philosophy can only fix names and definitions; this is a great advance in knowledge, or a facility for advancing; since names or words are vehicles of thought, and help to give fixedness and definiteness to our ideas; they are like handles, by which we can take hold of things readily, and use them with more ease: and thus the words CONSCIENCE, IMAGINATION, REASON, convey definite knowledge, and give prominence to certain parts of our mental constitution. Without these technical names, we should find a difficulty in thinking, and an impossibility in speaking of mind.

Wipe out all the names from botany, and see what science would be left: or blot out human language, and how much knowledge should we have? Words and names, (language in general,) stand in the same relation to knowledge, as money, or a circulating medium to property. And therefore, false names, are as dangerous as *base coin*.

Finally, it is asserted, that philosophy has made no progress,—that whilst the natural science of antiquity is "mere childishness and dotage"—"their logicians, metaphysicians and moralists, are very nearly on a

* Ed. Review, Vol. xvii.

level with those of the present day." And yet the same authority, gives as a reason for the decline of mental philosophy, the following. "The destruction of ancient errors, has hitherto constituted so large a part of the task of modern philosophers, that they may be said to have been employed rather in throwing down than in building up." How then can they be on a level with the ancients, until they are thrown down themselves?

Nay, the same writer admits, that by the aid of philosophy, Mr. Stewart in his Philosophical Essays, has refuted the errors of Horne Tooke, who founded on philology, certain theories, looking for truth in language, etymologically analyzed. "In exposing and refuting the manifold errors, that are implied in these positions, Mr. Stewart has presented us with the finest specimens we have anywhere met with,—of clear and profound reasoning,—full and satisfactory elucidation."

Nay, further, we may retort this charge of barrenness, and want of progress; by the assertion, that the progress of physics, has resulted from improved metaphysics,—from bringing the philosophy of mind to bear on questions of natural science:—improving the methods of enquiry.

Bacon, the founder of modern improvements in natural science, began by improving the mental science of those who make such enquiries their pursuit. "*Before laying down the rules to be observed in this inductive process,*" says Playfair in his Dissertation of Mathematical and Physical Science, "Bacon proceeds to enumerate the causes of error,—the Idols as he terms them, in his figurative language, or false divinities, to which the mind had so long been accustomed to bow. He considered this enumeration as the more necessary (because) that the same idols were likely to return, even after the reformation of science, and avail themselves of the real discoveries that might have been made, for giving a colour to their deceptions.

These Idols he divides into four classes, to which he gives names, fantastical no doubt, but at the same time abundantly significant.

1. *Idola Tribus*, Idols of the Tribe;
2. *Idola Specus*, Idols of the Den;
3. *Idola Fori*, Idols of the Forum;
4. *Idola Theatri*, Idols of the Theatre."

1st. Those common misapprehensions to which the race of man is liable; the mind being "not like a plain mirror, which reflects the images of things exactly as they are; but one of an uneven surface, which combines its own figure with that of the object it represents." This is Bacon's illustration of the first wrong tendency: and under this, is generally placed, the disposition to jump at conclusions, from hasty generalizations; called sometimes the spirit of the system.

2. The Idols of the Den; questionable tendencies, arising from the peculiarity of individual tastes and pursuits.

3. Idols of the Forum, or Market-place; arising from association, and the misapplications of figurative words.

4. Idols of the Theatre; arising from the warping influence of theories already on the stage. Thus improvements in natural science, have resulted from improvements in mental philosophy, on which the principles of investigation are founded.

REVIEWS AND CRITICISMS.

Health Made Easy for the People; or, Physical Training, to make their lives in this world, long and happy. By JOSEPH BENTLEY. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co.

This work has enjoyed much popular favour, this being the sixth five thousand-edition. It is simple and popular in style, and practical in its character; and succeeds in making plain to the simplest understanding, the science of diet, air, exercise, and cleanliness. In explaining the mechanism of the human frame, it constantly recognizes the Being by whom we are fearfully and wonderfully made. One part of the work, however, we could wish had not been written, or written on somewhat different principles: we refer to the *confusion of physical and mental training*, as though they were identical. Undoubtedly bodily weakness, lassitude, and pain, tend to incommode and impede the mind; yet the health of the one, is not necessarily the health of the other. But the writer shall speak for himself.

"On the improbability of our Mental and Moral powers, lesson xviii." he observes to the readers:—"You see here, how necessary it is for the moral sense of right and wrong to step in and forbid such indulgences, with most resolute firmness: keep constantly in mind, the fact, that every time you indulge these feelings, they become more difficult to subdue, for two reasons depending on the same law. The passions become stronger, from the exercise you give them; while the moral power which should keep them in check is weaker from not being duly exercised.

You will be able to form a more clear idea of the growing, and strengthening of the brain, and the wise provision that is made to admit of this being done to a very great extent in youth, if you work it well in school, and during divine service, by looking at Fig. 14, which shows the back part of the cranium or skull. The jagged lines or sutures, mark its three divisions during infancy, childhood, and youth; and you may see some of the divisions in the brow, by looking at Fig. 9, page 56.

When the whole powers of the mind and brain of a child, or young person, are duly and properly exercised constantly, to the extent its constitution will bear, a vigorous, healthy flow of blood ascends to aid the action of the brain, and its several parts, and promote their growth. This swelling out, so to speak of the brain, causes it to press the inner sides of the skull; which being, as you see, in three parts, can yield to this pressure from within; and growing larger at the edges, as well as in other parts, can easily accommodate itself to your commands, either to enlarge very fast or very slowly, during youth.

But in after life, all those divisions join, and the eight pieces of the skull become one bone; when it is with very great difficulty any further growth of the BRAIN takes place; though the activity and vigour of our mental faculties may be greatly increased by persevering culture, during the middle period of life. If you duly develop the whole brain while you are young, by a constant exercise of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual powers, and keep the animal feelings and passions under the control and guidance of those highest faculties, you do well.

If, on the contrary, you should unfortunately not do this, or what is worse, indulge your animal feelings and passions to excess, and neglect all the high and delight-giving endowments of your mind, your case will be bad indeed, when you are grown up."

Without entering into the controversy suggested by these observations, we would simply enquire of Mr. Bentley, what advantage, in force and clearness, is gained by a reference to the head at all? Has the learner any better idea of the fact, that conscience and reason and memory become more efficient by exercise, from looking at the open sutures of the skull? Is not the fact known, without such reference, and would not the mind improve by its proper exercise, if the skull were never thought of? Instead, therefore, of describing the flow of blood to the brain, increasing its growth, might he

not as advantageously refer to the flow of knowledge to the understanding, and of religious truth to the conscience? The lesson intended, is perfectly independent of the physical circumstances introduced for illustration. Or rather, the illustration contradicts the lesson, for whilst these sutures close, and leave the brain shut up fast in a bone case, *the mind grows prodigiously after the supposed "wise provision" is taken away.* Indeed, we should be very sorry for the genius whose mind stopped growing, when the skull became one hard bone.

It is not from looking at the brain, but from looking at his books, that a youth will grow intelligent. He may become vain and empty-headed, by looking at his forehead in a glass; a danger to which he is somewhat exposed by Mr. Bentley's method of calling a large head a *gigantic mind*.

He favours his readers with two figures, one seemingly intended for the head of Melancthon, called a "giant mind;" another, the figure of an idiot's head, called a "mental dwarf."

This is a wondrous fallacy, and no help, if a truth; for Melancthon did not make his head, and perhaps did not in any way add to its size; whilst the idiot is equally helpless in this matter; nor is any certain rule given, by which the pupil may attain to Melancthon's size of skull.

Fortunately, it is of little consequence, for plainly, Melancthon as much exceeded Luther in volume of brain, as an ordinary head exceeds that of an idiot; yet Luther was superior in everything but school learning; and perhaps was not much behind even in that. Melancthon's "giant mind," or large head, produced only a milk and water character, or a piece of GIGANTIC VACILLATION. He was a "cloud without water," having brain without power. Newton was for a long time supposed to have had a large head, and hence, mental-physiologists admired his powers; but since it has been proved that on this point, as on many others of a like kind, there has been much exaggeration; some phrenologists have begun to depreciate *Newton's intellect*; saying he was only a mathematician!

The prints of heads conveyed traditionally from book to book, are very little to be relied on; whilst the few that may be accurate, are *picked instances*,—as a ferocious looking murderer, or intelligent looking philosopher.

Some modern instances of murder, will not figure in the books of phrenologists, as Professor Webster, in America, Drory and others, in England: for most of these brainal philosophers prefer *marked instances*, which occur very seldom.

We should be sorry to be considered as depreciating Mr. Bentley's work by these animadversions; since they rather shew how much importance we attach to a book that we should like to see purified from such blemishes.

Teachers of youth may reap much advantage, both from the information and method of this writer; and notwithstanding this digression into mental-physiology, they will learn from this author as well as from Herr Teufelsdröckh, that "mind grows not like a vegetable, (by having its roots littered with etymological compost,) but like a spirit, by mysterious contact of spirit; thought, kindling itself at the fire of living thought."

And though the want of ventilation in schools, will enfeeble and emaciate the bodies, and so distract the mind of the pupils, none will mistake ventilation and exercise for the instrument of thought. Any more than the last race of school masters mistook the cane or the birch for the intellectual organ,—though it was their mental reviver according to the phrenology of the "Hinterschlag Professors," who "knew syntax enough; and of the human soul" thus much; that it had a faculty called memory, and could be acted on through the muscular integument, by appliance of birch rods."

The History of Greece, from the earliest period to the Roman Conquest; with a sketch of its modern history to the present time. Adapted for schools and families. By Miss CORNER. London: Dean & Son, Threadneedle Street.

This work deserves a larger notice than we have space for; it is properly described as "*adapted for schools and families.*" The subjects are clearly arranged in chapters, with "questions to each, and a full chronological index," which will prove of great service to the reader.

Good use is made of the best modern authorities, such as Thirlwall's *Greece*, Grote's *History of Greece*, Smith's *Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, *Greek and Roman Antiquities*, &c.

The majority of readers can neither spare the time nor the money for these larger works; and even those who can, will find a helpful remembrancer in this work, by Miss CORNER, who has condensed much modern scholarship, without losing its true spirit.

Studies of First Principles. By James Baldwin BROWN, A.B. With a Preface. By the Rev. Thomas BINNEY. London: Ward & Co. Paternoster Row.

This work consists of a series of Tracts, each of which is full of useful and weighty suggestions; the value consisting as much in the thoughts awakened, as in those presented; which is the most fruitful style of Authorship. We cordially commend these studies of *First Principles*, to the intelligent reader.

Papa and Mamma's Easy Lessons in Geography; with numerous Illustrations. By Anna Maria SARGHANT. London: Dean and Son, Threadneedle Street.

This contribution to youthful education, is attractive both in style and appearance, and unites simplicity of diction with sterling sense.

Divine Providence Considered and Illustrated. By Charles HARGREAVES. London: Ward & Co. Paternoster Row.

The important subject of Providence, in its various relations, is here treated of in a simple and popular manner: the work abounds in interesting illustrations, drawn from a variety of sources, and whilst avoiding a too dry and abstract method, is not without vigour of thought. It will be read with pleasure, instruction, and profit.

The Church of Christ, her duty and auxiliaries: to which is added, Six Ecclesiastical Twigs. By A PLAIN MAN. Ward & Co. Paternoster Row.

A bird's eye view of the various agencies at work in the extension of the gospel,—colleges, schools, periodicals, newspapers, and missions; with the writer's estimate of their efficiency. The subjects are too numerous for a small pamphlet to contain a full examination of them, and require a more than ordinary power of insight for their adequate treatment.

A Tract for the Times: Not the Church, Not the Pope, But the Bible. By William THWAITES. Houlston & Stoneman, Paternoster Row.

A very serviceable Sixpenny Pamphlet; carrying out completely a clear idea,—the insufficiency of "the Church" as a guide. The method adopted is simple and striking; the Primitive Churches are examined in the order of the Apostolical Epistles, and each in turn is shewn from Scripture to have the elements of corruption: hence they are no safe guides.

From this well executed plan, respecting the Primitive Church, the writer advances to the respective claims of the Pope, the Scriptures and Tradition.

"The Glorious Liberty of the Children of God." A Letter, addressed to the common people of the Roman Catholic Laity. By EMANCIPATOR. Whitfield, Essex Street, Strand.

A short but effective friendly Address to Roman Catholics, on the value of liberty, especially spiritual liberty, and the *authority* by which the Catholic Laity are deprived of this. If in addition to the natural and Christian liberty of private judgment, as an emancipation from bondage to priests, the writer had shewn the completeness of the Redeemer's sacrifice and intercession, rendering human interference unnecessary, this useful tract would have been more complete and valuable.

Still, to secure freedom from authority, and the unfettered use of the Scriptures, will include every thing else.

I.

CHRIST'S RELIGION.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD." 1 Thess. v. 21.

THE THEORY OF PROGRESS EXAMINED :

OR,

THE PERMANENT TEST OF RELIGIOUS TRUTH, IN THE WRITTEN WORD
OF GOD.

GOD has mercifully bestowed upon man two great blessings,—when he breathed into man the breath of life, he endowed our race with a wise and understanding heart, an intelligent or rational soul; this was the first blessing, and is implied in our creation, with the nature we possess. In which he bestowed upon us faculties and desires suited to a physical and temporary existence; as well to a spiritual and eternal destiny. But the mere possession of such powers, would be incomplete, did not the same goodness provide also a suitable sphere of objects and truths, on which these faculties could be employed. Capacities are nothing until trained; they are mere possibilities, and need the requisite circumstances, or fitting occasions, to call forth and engage these faculties, and bring them to maturity.

Accordingly, God has provided man with two large schools for the development of his nature; the school of creation,—the natural world, as the sphere of our earthly activity; and the school of revelation, a world of spiritual objects, for the exercise and development of our spiritual powers and affections. And this also is a secondary sense, in which the inspiration of the Almighty, giveth understanding—by favouring us with a *revelation*—an inspired book, as the fountain of heavenly wisdom.

Everything thrives best on its own elements, or a support closely akin to itself: if we would know whether any particular productions will thrive in any given spot of ground, we must analyze both; to see whether that soil contains such elements, as will contribute to this produce. So with the nature of man, as evinced in the history of his creation: God made man, that is, the body, out of the dust of the ground; and for this earthly element in our nature, we want earthly objects and support: accordingly, we are provided with the home and materials of this world. Look again, at the next stage in this creative process,—and God breathed into man the breath of life; here we have a figurative description of the original of man's higher nature; that as his body did not grow out of the ground, like animals and trees, which the Lord caused to grow; so his soul did not come from the ground at all; but was breathed into him by the Creator; whose inspiration then gave an understanding spirit. Now as the body taken from the earth, is nour-

ished by the earth; so the soul coming from God, must feed on divine elements,—the bread which cometh down from heaven. Man is therefore not to live by bread alone, but by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God:—one is the life of the body; the other is the life of the soul. And this is what we wish now more especially to explain;—the relation of that *soul*, which God inspired, to that *book* which he has inspired: and our statement is, that the consideration of this inspired truth, by the faculties of this soul,—is the true and only way to arrive at higher wisdom, or spiritual understanding.

The tendency of all real subjects of thought, is to quicken and enlarge the faculties, according to the nature of the subject; whether philosophy, science, literature, or accomplishments; each has its appropriate effect, in enlarging or liberalizing the mind. All real objects of thought are to the mind, what the grinding stone is to the axe, or the whetstone to the razor, sharpening and improving the faculties by exercise: nay more, knowledge and study, the reception and acquisition of information, is to the soul, what air and sunlight are to the natural world, the grand fostering influence by which growth and beauty are promoted. Hence the inspiration of the Almighty, containing a revelation of himself, will have a healthful and sanctifying effect, according to its nature, and in proportion to its intelligent reception.

As without the advantage of experience, use and exercise, we cannot by the eye discern the distance, direction, or magnitude of any objects; so the soul is in effect blind without something on which to exercise itself, and learns to see only in proportion to this free and vigorous exercise. Consider how dim and confused are the intimations of the senses in a new born infant; how imperfect the sight of a man whose eyes are newly couched, until perfected by experience; so it is with the moral nature of man, until his senses have been exercised to discern good and evil.

That therefore which gives the noblest objects for contemplation, is most adapted to give "understanding." But the Bible contains the highest and holiest truths, bringing us face to face with the express image of God,—the fulness of all perfection. "And the divine nature" (says Dr. South, on Ps. cxiv. 9.) "is the light and the refreshment of a rational creature: God is of all beings the most amiable, suitable, and desirable: all the loveliness, the beauty, and perfection, that is diffused and scattered here and there, through the whole creation, and which is so apt to excite and win our affections, is in an infinite, inexhaustible manner, treasured up in God." And naturally, for the work can only dimly embody the perfections of the worker; they must exist in him, in a superior degree: whilst therefore nature is an exhibition of the works of God, the Bible is in a peculiar manner the exhibition of God himself: this book therefore, as the inspiration of the Almighty, which makes us intimately acquainted with him, must be the best source of "understanding."

Here then we have the great standard of religious truth, and source of a renewed nature, that inspiration which giveth understanding, by illuminating a darkened mind; awakening a dormant conscience, and giving pure and constraining motives to a corrupted heart.

We are however met with one great difficulty—is this volume of in-

piration, capable of itself (*i.e.* apart from *human* intervention) of illuminating the great mass of men; by its appeal to their private convictions; or does it require the external wisdom of any human agents, to fix its meaning and enforce its decisions? The Bible, is it sufficient and final, as a standard and test of religious truth, or do we require a teacher who is above revelation? Shall we seek the law from the oracles of God; enquire at his mouth, or at the mouth of a judge whose decisions become the expressed and authoritative law to enquirers? There are two classes of religionists who adopt the idea that the Bible is not enough, and advocate a tribunal above the Bible, to decide upon its truths for the people at large. These two classes, are very far from each other in many respects, and do not adopt the same method of expression on this subject; but foster the same idea: these are—on the one hand, Catholics and Puseyites, all who advocate Church tradition and authority; whilst on the other hand, there are the rationalists and all those who deny what are considered by us to be the peculiar and fundamental truths of Christianity.

The abettors of superstition and Church authority, deny the sufficiency of the Bible, because their inventions are too glaring, and their creed too large, to be admitted by plain people, with a plain Bible in their hands: whilst the rationalists decry the sufficiency of the Bible, and urge the necessity of learning and judgment, to sober down inspired extravagances; to warn men at every turn, of metaphors and eastern symbols from which a large discount is to be deducted. The advocate of Church tradition, is afraid that with the Bible only, people will believe too little, the rationalist is afraid, that with the Bible only, plain men will believe too much. Hence the one calls up natural light, in opposition to religion, and the other calls in Church authority in aid of superstition.

We have not now to point out the mistakes on this subject, committed by these opposite communions; but to meet this delusion in another shape, as it has endeavoured to cover its deformity with a philosophical cloak. And this we do the more earnestly, because the insufficiency of the Scriptures, has of late been advocated by one who has no sympathy with either rationalists or the superstitious, though his philosophy, from its vague and unguarded form, may be employed by either of these parties.

The writer in question,* attempts to establish the test of truth, on religious, as well as on other subjects; in a series of four lectures, on the philosophical tendencies of the age:—the various standards of fundamental truth, which men have advocated. First, he notices positivism; which deals chiefly in facts of a physical nature, and brings all truth to the test of man's senses.

The advocates of this positive science, would reduce all our knowledge to natural philosophy: and the highest deductions, to certain laws of nature: as if laws were anything real in power, instead of a method in which the lawgiver of the universe operates: as if men could by the exercise of mere sense, reach beyond sensation, and ever get into the region of science. We require some firmer basis for truth of all kinds than this; the whole method, though supported by names of large scien-

* J. D. Morell; four Lectures, on the Philosophical Tendencies of the Age. John Johnstone, London, 1848.

tific pretensions, being nothing better than a blind mole, burrowing in the earth to feel the beauty of creation; to weigh and measure the sun-beams.

The second standard, is named individualism; because the private convictions of any man, are regarded as the last court of appeal; since if you advance the authority of another, the individual must judge of the validity of such authority. But the author we are considering, dismisses private reason, as not being a philosophical test of truth; because of its variations: there is perhaps an ambiguity here,—confounding the test or standard with the judge. THE TEST of truth in all cases, is THE APPROPRIATE DATA OR EVIDENCE. For whether private judgment be a philosophic test or not, *it is the only possible final judge for every individual.* He next discusses what is called traditionalism; in the authority of parents, of documents, and of communities: against which he also decides. But proposes as a final test of truth, the common consciousness of humanity; the universal experiences and convictions of mankind. Certainly a very wide field for enquiry, and where any one must become lost, in hunting after a decision of any question of difficulty or importance. And indeed if individuals are so liable to err, mankind altogether, would present only a combination of these individual errors. But we are told that the progress of the world, is to be our test;—those ideas which have become embodied in the growing intelligence of the age: this however, is not the common consciousness of mankind; but the opinion of a few, as the ages roll on; and is therefore a selection from humanity; and not its general voice. Nor need we appeal to men in general, to find out those fundamental truths which belong to all; since if they are the consciousness of humanity, they should be well known to the enquirer; so that he can learn it all at home. This test therefore is useless: but let us see how it is defended, and how applied to religion.

We are told that humanity is destined to accomplish a given course; that this course is regulated by certain ideas, working in society, and wrought out into institutions; and that the philosophical test of truth is obtained by seizing hold of these ideas, as developed in the course of history.

Now it is not reasonable to suppose that whatever may have grown amongst the ideas and institutions of men, is therefore true; since many falsehoods obtain everywhere. This therefore might afford us *a true history of man; but not a history of truth*: nor is it true to suppose, that human nature in itself is pursuing any round of truth, to be gradually developed, and become clearer in the course of ages: on the contrary, for many ages the progress of the world was a going backwards, a descent in ignorance and iniquity; both to the time of the flood, and subsequently to the time of the Saviour. And if at any periods since that time men have advanced, it has not been human nature working out its destiny, but divine truth, coming as the salt of a corrupted and corrupting world.

When Christ came, it would not have done for men to seek this test of truth in the experience of mankind, or in the progress of society, or in the notions of any select class of men: and what was no test then, is no test now. As soon as the gospel came, it introduced a new element

of progress; and that progress was no standard, but was to be measured by, and compared with the gospel. And when that gospel became hidden, men no longer progressed, but again went backward, till it again appeared. Any improvement, is not from the development of human nature, but from the reception and development of divine truth, as contained in the written word, which is the impulse and measure of advancement. "The *material* of philosophy," may "be taken from the common consciousness of mankind;" but the material of *religion cannot be derived from such a source*. It is a great mistake therefore of this writer to affirm, that "the human consciousness is the soil, in which these germs of (religious) truth must vegetate and grow, and that *to it we must consequently appeal, as the great authority*, which can alone solve, in the course of time, and by the effort of labour, the great controversies, which for so many centuries have agitated the world." Nor is it true, that if we had a "fixed test of truth, humanity would outgrow it:" for we have a fixed test both of truth and character in the written word, which humanity will not outgrow; but which it would do *well to grow up to*. "What we require," says the same writer, "is a method by which we can ascend to the full elevation of the age in which we live, and get the clearest view of grand principles, which the present *state of human development can afford*." We want no such thing, for we have a standard far higher than the present human development, and the type of man's highest dignity: this is our test,—*the inspiration of the Almighty which giveth understanding*. And the individual who must judge of the progress of the world, could as soon learn the mind of God, as the mind of the age. Nor can we allow, that "the living spirit, the whole religious consciousness of humanity in its providential growth, acted on by the divinely inspired Christian element, is the real expounder and interpreter of the full truth and meaning of Christ's holy religion." For the character of the Christian world, is by no means a fair index even of its acknowledged creeds, and therefore, can least of all be a fair standard of religious truth.

That the Bible presupposes, certain common principles in man, is undoubted, since it appeals in the same manner to all men, and therefore supposes that we have a *nature*, or principles of reason and conscience, on which its truths may fasten; but this is *implied as much in reference to every individual as to all mankind*; and therefore does not make the world in general, in preference to an individual, the test of truth; but supposes that *all want certain truths*, with which the Bible comes to supply them:* commending the truth "to every man's conscience," as the judge.

The inspiration of the Almighty gave us understanding,—a nature fitted to receive certain truths; his inspiration in the Bible, has supplied those truths, and of these we are to judge by the previous inspiration,—the endowment of rational faculties.

In further setting aside this theory, *which is only ANOTHER FORM OF TRADITION*, we shall notice some objections to the sufficiency of private judgment, secondly, show the danger of any other standard than the Bible—whether traditional creeds or character,—and thirdly, shew that the Bible repudiates any authority but itself. The enquiry here is not

* See 142, P. S. to Lect. iii.

whether there be any other source of *Christian life* but whether there be any other fountain or test of *Christian truth* besides the Scriptures. The written word furnishes us with doctrines, the living Redeemer to whom the word directs us, furnishes with life, as we come into vital communion with him. With this explanation we proceed to notice,—

1. First, the objections to individual judgment, as sufficient in religious enquiry. It is asserted, that Protestants practically deny the liberty of private judgment, in not welcoming indiscriminately, into their particular communion, those who have arrived at different doctrines. But this rejection, is only an exercise of that private judgment; a religious society or sect, is a body of men, preferring their own opinions, which precludes them from recognizing as of the same communion, those who hold opinions subversive of the doctrines on which that community is based: and to extend which, that community exists. The acknowledgment of a member with opposite views, would be the acknowledgment of his opinions, and therefore an abandonment of their own; which the right of private conscience cannot require. Though in general there is much room left for latitude of opinion, on non-essential points.

It is secondly asserted, that documentary evidence, and private judgment exercised thereupon, is not enough, because "documents embody only dead letters, and not living thoughts—we want a vital one, to interpret the dead: a mind or spirit, to pour its radiance over the letter."*

This is no doubt founded on an erroneous view of St. Paul's statement to the Corinthians, ii. 3, 6. The same mistake is made by a writer of "word," seems to have read it to little purpose. Speaking of various of another cast, who in opposing the "letter," and depreciating the parts of the Bible, he says, "Men have been told that if they accepted Christianity, they must take these accessories along with it; that the living spirit could not be had, without the killing letter."† If we turn to the second epistle to Cor. iii. 6, we shall see the misapplication of such terms: the Apostle says, "who hath enabled us to be ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Does he then by the letter, mean the word of God? by no means; but the *literal and formal system* of Jewish service;—a slavish attention to these, having a tendency to bondage; whilst the gospel or New Testament is called the spirit, as being a system of freedom; and spontaneous devotedness. But the word of God is not the killing letter; it is not to be illuminated by man, but is to illuminate man; it is not a *dead symbol but a living truth*. As even the last mentioned objector acknowledges, when he forgets his theory:—"It is these words, which still work wonders, build our temples, raise our thoughts of sublimity, purify our ideal of purity, give wings to our aspirations: what charms they are! Sorrow is lulled at their bidding." And a greater than either of these has said, "THE WORDS that I speak unto you, THEY ARE SPIRIT, AND THEY ARE LIFE."

But we are told, that all classes of Christians, admit the necessity of some final appeal, beyond mere documentary evidence: the Catholic appealing to the Church; the Protestant to the aid of a special and divine

* Page 115. Morell's Lectures.

† Theodore Parker's Discourse on the transient and permanent in Christianity.

instructor. By this special and divine instructor, may be understood, the Holy Spirit; or possibly "the living authority residing in the different communities of the Christian world."—the ministry, and those truths, which their particular Churches expect them to teach. But teachers amongst true Protestants, do not give their own authority, nor that of their Church; but that of the Bible; at any rate they recognize this as giving validity to their doctrines: and the Holy Spirit, regarded as an instructor, is a guide to private judgment.

From these and similar objections it is concluded, that we require a standard of truth, above private judgment, more definite and final than the written word; namely, the progress of Christian character, its development in the lives of Christians!

This theory has been differently expressed, by one who follows out its whole consequences:—"there can be but one religion, which is absolutely true, existing in the facts of human nature, and the ideas of the infinite God." Again,—“the sum of religious doctrines, is both the result and the measure of man's total growth in wisdom, virtue and piety.”—"Christianity exists eternal, in the constitution of the human soul, and the mind of God." The facts of human nature then, and the constitution of the soul, would have rendered any revelation unnecessary. This author finds authority in Paul, for the assertion, that "it is not by the Christ who lived eighteen hundred years ago that we are saved, but by the Christ we form in our hearts."* There could not be a greater perversion of language; and the letter *ought* to be *dead*, before undergoing such treatment; for there cannot be much life in it afterwards. We are to turn then for our test of religious truth, to the Christian consciousness, of the best Churches, and the most pious men! What a wide field of dancing meteors, is here presented to settle our faith: shall we copy the best Christians, and find our truth in mortal man? alas! in many things we all offend; how therefore shall we know what part of their lives to imitate; or indeed what men to call Christians, unless we first look into the written word for their description? And if we must try them by the word, how can we try the word by them? And if we look to past ages or present attainments, as our standard, what room is there for that advancement, which results from an ideal that goes beyond what is realized? We must not therefore look for Christian truth and perfection, in past or present men; nor become lost in the fruitless search after the general practised consent of ages, but turn to the grand model of all perfection, in the character and words of the Redeemer. Not finding Christian life and truth in others, as the model and well-spring of our own; but coming in all humbleness to him, who hides these things from the wise and prudent, and reveals them unto babes. God has not manifested himself in the progress of the Church, but in the person of his Son. And therefore the progress of enlightened Christianity is no test of truth: otherwise, it would also be the standard of duty: and therefore we ought to preach from and believe in the Bible of human progress; it is futile to escape by a distinction between a "moral" and an "intellectual" test; for *what is true is right*; and therefore on this new principle, we are freed from the Bible altogether.

* Theodore Parker's Discourse.

2. We shall in the next place, point out the danger of trusting to any such traditional character, or growing spirit of the age. Observe how every society, gathers around it the enlightenment of its own peculiar notions;—an atmosphere, the result of its growing character. Abstractedly, one tradition of this sort is as good as another: must therefore men judge of all things, through the light of that society to which they belong? Thus the worldling looks at the Christian;—by *his* philosophical test of truth;—“*what men of sense would think.*” So also Clarendon judged of Cromwell, when he condemned that singularity and severity of manners, which made the hero of his times look ridiculous in the eyes of good fellows, whose excesses he would not indulge in.

What then is the true method?—to the law and the testimony; and by this, to test the traditional character—the enlightenment of our age or clan.

It is true we have one great advantage, in almost all societies,—that the traditional character, however bad, retains some germs of goodness—a possibility of better things; the fragments of better feelings, which have not been utterly eradicated; gleams of a higher light, not yet utterly extinguished: and these leave open a road for the introduction of a larger body of truth. Thus the Saviour spoke to men, sometimes as the children of nature, and reminded them of the obvious bounties of providence, in rain and sunshine: at other times, as the followers of Moses; and hence told them to *search the Scriptures*: so also the Apostles made the views of their Hebrew audiences, a wedge by which to introduce him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets wrote: Paul addressing the Heathen, took hold of a part of their traditional acknowledgment—the unknown God; as a text, from which to declare the God that made the worlds: and thus the use of every traditional atmosphere, is—not to be the standard of truth, but providentially to retain some element of life amidst the “congregation of pestilent vapours,” called the spirit of the age, and the progress of society. With these remaining living elements, the new truth can unite by elective affinity, and precipitate the accompanying errors into the residuum of exploded notions. Thus all trainings, contain some elements, on which a better teacher may work; as all new instructions are based fundamentally (at least as to their grounds of reception) on principles or admissions contained or implied in the old. (Without this, there could be no argumentum ad hominem—no point of appeal.)

But whilst our atmosphere may not be so depraved, as to have lost all elements of truth, it is never the standard of truth, but should itself be tested, by something that does not change with the passions of men. We should enquire for instance, whether the spirit of the age, the traditions of glory and war, are the outworkings of gospel truths,—the testimony of humanity under divine culture, or the conflagration of human passions, lighting the clouds with a false and destructive glare: we must not decide by what the majority of professed Christians think; but enquire whether this be a seed from the hand of the great sower, and whether it has brought forth fruit *after the kind of gospel principles*. All other sources of religious knowledge are repudiated, as being the spirit of the world—the combined agency of individual error and depravity.

We must not come to the Bible, with the commentary of the duellist's code of honour, to find out its doctrine of revenge; but try the code of honour, by the Scriptures: the other method, is not the living spirit of Christianity illuminating the dead letter of the word, but the exhalations of a foul morass of prejudice, which blears and dims the eye; and blunts the sensibility to higher truths;—nor is the letter dead, but the repository of living truth; that receives not life from character, but gives life to character; that is not illuminated by the age, but is the illuminator of the age.

We are not to walk in the light of the age, but to bring the principles of the world and of the Church, to the true light, that it may be manifest—whether they are of God. The advancements made in religious knowledge at any time, have not resulted from the progress of the Church, illuminating the written word; but from this word having previously sanctified the Church. Did Luther seek the highest point of general enlightenment, and steer his course by the beacon-lights of embodied Christianity? Did the conclusions of the common Christian world guide him to understand the dead letter? No! God spoke to his heart, and the word gave life. Protestantism thus arose; and gave the impulse even to natural science. And the reason why at certain times, the Bible has been read or talked of, without producing a general effect, is not (as George Combe says respecting witch-burning, &c.) the absence of a foreign illumination,—it is not because we want the torch of science, but because a foreign and previous darkness shrouded men's minds; and the phantoms of superstition danced before their eyes, whilst they imagined they were reading the word of God. And when that word had really become more popular, contributing to a better state of public mind, then men saw its truths, through the medium of that mental atmosphere which the word had first purified.

Men do not understand political economy better, because the age is more enlightened, but the age is more enlightened because they do understand it: so men do not understand the gospel better, because they are more informed, but are more informed, because they have come gradually to understand it.

The improved theory of toleration, is not a better spirit of the age, helping men to understand the Bible; but a better acquaintance with the Bible producing a better spirit in society. We do not see more into any science, because we are more enlightened; but are more enlightened because we see more into it.

To say that we read the Bible more understandingly by the improved light of the age, is like saying we see the sun by the light of the day: the sun brings the day; we did not see it before, because this world stood between us and it; the world has turned round to the sun and so is illuminated; and mankind will sit in darkness, till they turn to the Sun of righteousness, and hail the day spring from on high. We must not look at this book through the spectacles of our public traditions or private passions; since it aims to break through all these, and by manifestation of truth, to commend itself to *every man's conscience*, in the sight of God, not in the sight of embodied Christianity.

But notwithstanding all this, we may gladly recognize the aid of in-

struction from more experienced men ; we refuse authority ; but accept aid : we are willing to look through the telescope of others' greater wisdom and learning, that thus we may see the constellations which God has made ; but cannot wait to look into the peep-show of human authority, to be amused and misled by the puppets moved by the artifices of priests, and magnified into gods by the atmosphere of ignorance and superstition :—nor into the equally vain show of philosophical speculations ;—the thaumatrope of genius.

Going by the light of certain societies, taking their embodiments and views of Christianity, has been the bane of Christendom ; the curse of the world, and the disgrace of the Church. There is a traditional amount of Christian duty, as well as of Christian creeds ;—the creed being, submission to the prescribed formularies, symbols or watchwords of some Church : and the duty being, a respectable and regular or occasional acknowledgment thereof, by a definite amount of fashionable religion :—which may be as clearly defined as any fashion of dress, and is of the same depth ; both being on the surface ; ornamental badges. Now many who are within such a circle, talk of religion, or Protestantism, or Church, or whatever the symbol may be ; who are almost imbecile, on all higher questions of divine truth, though passing not only as respectable and moderately informed, but as intelligent individuals. And why are so many in our land, thus stunted in their spiritual nature ? Simply because their religion, like their dress, is a thing ready made for them, with the science and foundation of which they have nothing to do, except to put it on, and wear it with a grace :—persons who as they wear the livery of the age, and change in appearance with the fashions, so, and on the same principle, may change the cut of their religion ; because they have never been *exercised* in that sublime science, the inspiration of the Almighty, which giveth understanding. It is by familiarity with and earnest study of this inspiration, that the mental and spiritual stature of men is elevated ;—consider the condition of men, where there is no revelation from God ; how stunted and distorted the spiritual nature becomes :—either one thick cloud of entire barbarism, or refined ignorance and learned trifling, takes the place of manly or devout thought and character. Look at the Egyptians, and their degrading idolatry, in connexion with mechanical advances, and superficial civilization. Or the present Hindoos, with sharpness and cultivation, but without deep and expansive truths ; employing their ingenuity to defend their ignorance, and confirm the tyranny of their degrading superstitions. The same may be said of the Chinese : in all such cases, the mental powers are withered, and the moral nature is debased. For just as men cannot advance in science, except by having a world of objects on which to employ their faculties ; so neither can they advance in intellectual and moral character, without those truths which enlarge and sanctify :—without “ having their senses exercised to discern between good and evil.” So also, in despotic countries, where the religious element is dwarfed by the authority of government, and the dominion of priests, there is a corresponding weakness of religious principle ; together with a looseness and facility of faith, that can swallow all extravagances, or subscribe to them in secret scorn and Atheism.

Mind and character, like body and natural productions, depend for

health on food and training; grow into the element they feed on; and therefore, our religious nature can flourish only amidst spiritual light and freedom; as flowers come to perfection only in the breath and sunlight of heaven. And this development, will not result from stereotyped knowledge, traditionally carried down, as the atmosphere of society, but from an individual process of digestion and assimilation;—till these common truths are embodied in our understanding, convictions and character. To be fully refreshed, we must ourselves visit the fountain. Whatever is borne to us and passively adopted, is mixed or vitiated. The second-hand, or traditional method of dealing with religious truth, finding it in the developments of Christian societies, instead of in the word of God, is necessarily dangerous: the very nature of fame or report, is, to enlarge in its course, and from a little cloud, to cover the heavens.

Hence the necessity of a recurrence to written documents. See how all history has to be re-written, and the fables of tradition thrown aside, by the discovery of medals and manuscripts, state papers and private letters; which reveal the incompetency or dishonesty of traditional historians. Just so it is with Revelation; when the world turned again to this, how much of fable had to be laid aside! *Reports* are admitted in no other court, but the *ecclesiastical court* of superstition: here alone, "hear-say" is defended, but we must return to the strictness of evidence; and require direct, definite proofs. Accordingly, to guard us against the exaggeration of rumour or tradition God has provided a written and authentic document; which abides in black and white, with his signature, for our guidance. We find in Nehemiah, viii. 2, 3—13, an instance of a return to the written document, mixed with instruction thereupon. This is the only safe method: nor is there anything contrary to this, in the case of Philip and the Eunuch; though the ingenuity of authority, ought to find here a shadow of defence. "Understandest thou what thou readest? How can I, except some man should guide me?"—(Acts, viii. 30, 31.) This does not prove the same necessity for all men; since this proselyte would have fewer advantages than the Jews in their own country; and even they would need more guidance than we who have the commentary of the gospel, to throw back on prophecy the light of fulfilment.

And further, Philip was not to substitute his understanding, for that of the Eunuch; but to enable this disciple to understand the word of God;—not to receive any inferior authority. The great object of the Christian ministry, is to put men in remembrance of those things which they too readily forget; and collect together those considerations, which men engaged in worldly avocations, are of themselves unable to attend to. But this aid is especially required, because of men's indifference, rather than because of gospel mysteries;—not on account of the hardness of the Bible, but because of the indifference of men, who are but too well described thus:—"there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God."

A great many of the disputes and differences amongst Christians, have arisen upon questions about which the Bible is silent; and yet those who advocate tradition, and lead private enquirers altogether from the word of God, do so under the pretext of avoiding those differences which traditional disputes have occasioned: they give as a reason for leaving the word of God, that very want of union, which a departure from that word

has occasioned. Many questions have been derived from foreign speculation, instead of Scriptural enquiry, and may be compared to that puzzle presented to a learned society—why a vessel of water, was lighter when a fish was put into it than before? After considerable speculation, and guesses drawn from theories, to explain so strange an event, it was thought fit to try whether such was really the fact; and then they found they had been trying to explain a thing which did not exist. This was tradition in science; and is much the same as tradition in religion: on the one hand creating difficulties about what does not exist in nature, and on the other about what has no place in the Scriptures. The only true plan, is a return to facts. The other plan, is like persons who having looked at a picture, turn their backs on it, to form a theory: or like turning the picture to the wall, and then discussing its merits: this is studying *art as developed in human consciousness*;—in person's memory or impressions; and is the same thing as studying religion, in men's characters, instead of in God's book. A true student of art, would point to works of art, and back every observation, by pointing out a feature. The absence of this plan in religion, has led to all such notions as supererogation; dispensing power; disputes on the nature and times of repentance: mortal and venial sins, &c.—these are Romish traditions. Then again, we have the Jewish traditions travelling into Christian latitudes, putting monarchs in the chair of Moses; punishing our opponents as God's enemies; together with all the confusions, strifes and absurdities of a spiritual alliance with physical force.

These traditional tendencies, were partly checked by the Reformation, when Luther, by religious enquiry into the original, led the way for scientific enquiry into nature; and so set an example to Bacon, as a founder of the true method of research,—not into traditions, but into facts. And indeed, the first step towards understanding nature, is to learn something of God, which throws a light on natural enquiries;—like a sun-rise. The founder of modern science, threw off the enlightenment of the age, and tested tradition by fact; as Luther threw off Church embodiments, to look into the great fountain of truth: which the progress of the age had strangely beclouded. Tradition accumulates the idols of the tribe and of the den: the general and particular aberrations of mankind.

Innumerable evils have been perpetuated in the Church and the world, by this idolatry of men: thus people are satisfied to do as others do; they are no worse than their fellows, and have no ambition to be better: their Bible, is the custom of society, the enlightenment of the age, from which they select the part which suits them. But God will not bring forth the Bible of public opinion, and human progress, as our standard at the judgment day. Private fanaticism like public superstition, is equally a result of leaving the written document; when men wait for frames and feelings, and judge of the propriety of actions, by inward suggestions and satisfactions, instead of looking into the revealed will of God, to test all their inward impulses, which may come from another place besides heaven.

All Church traditions come from the same source. One writer of the present day,—a professor of philosophy in an English Protestant University, points to the parish clergyman as the last appeal and final test of truth. He might as well direct men to be the colour of the chameleon. A frequent

cry raised, is "hear the Church;" now the Church is herself a hearer, and not a speaker: a believer, and not to be believed in: or if she speaks, she is to utter the word of another,—her master: when she leaves this, she speaks a lie. For just as we employ the pen of an amanuensis or secretary, simply to utter our own thoughts;—as that secretary would be out of place, who should set up for principal, contravene orders, and steal his master's signature; so whoever speaks for the Redeemer, must speak only *his mind*: *for God never uses the mouth of any Church, except to utter his own words.* Now these words are written, and therefore every true speaker for God, will point to the document—the inspiration of the Almighty, which giveth understanding. Whoever do not point to this,—they are lying prophets and sanctified impostors. The true Apostolic Church, says—we preach "not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord:" the false Apostolic Church, "preaches not Jesus Christ, but itself the lord." An Apostle, means a person sent on an errand, and therefore a real messenger will deliver the master's message, and not forge one about himself. And consequently the validity of all messengers is proved, by the authenticity of their message; they do not give authority to it, but acquire authority from it, as they lay their finger on a passage, and say—"thus it is written."

We must no longer speak of appealing to the enlightenment of the age; nor to the Bible and *our Church*; the gospel and *our formularies*; the Scriptures and our catechisms; God's word and the Prayer Book; the inspired volume and our confession: since the only value of the general opinions in any community, is (as tentative hypotheses) to guide us in the direction of our enquiries, as we search the Scriptures, *to see (for ourselves) whether these things be so.* Whatever community gives its conclusions, as final and authoritative, and teaches them as stereotyped truths, to be accepted without enquiry, that society, aims to stunt men's spiritual growth, and is therefore not co-operating with the Almighty,—whose inspiration giveth understanding. The great work of all religious teaching, is to draw a portrait, as much like the Scripture original, as insight and skill of hand will allow; but that portrait can never be a standard; nor ever prove itself, except by a comparison with the original.

3. We may notice briefly in conclusion, that the word of God, not only does not recognize, but repudiates any standard above itself: and asserts and implies its own sufficiency:—its mission is, *to open men's eyes* and turn them from darkness to light.—(2 Cor. iv. 1—6.) God in the riches of his grace by Christ Jesus, "abounded towards us, in all wisdom and prudence,—having made known unto us the mystery of his will"—the word of his gospel; which though a stumbling block to the Jew, and foolishness to the Greek, is the power of God and the wisdom of God, to every one that believeth. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple:—the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes."—(Ps. xix. 7, 8.) "*I have MORE UNDERSTANDING THAN ALL MY TEACHERS, FOR thy testimonies are my meditation.*"—(Ps. cxix. 99.) "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." "*He is the true light, who coming into the world, enlighteneth every man:*"—(John i. 9.)—and who in reply to all the growth of past ages, sets aside the traditions of the fathers, with this rebuke and authority—"but I say unto you,"—

and therefore it is of little concern what hath "been said by them of old time," or is still said in the present day: amidst all superstitions, and fancies, and philosophies, there is one clear voice uttered on the house tops—"hearken unto ME, *every one* of you, and *understand*." Here is divine authority, and human freedom, we have one Master; to whom we are to listen with our own understanding.

To be true to what we already know, is the grand canon by which to know more: our spiritual discernment and intuition, like all other discernment, grows with our spiritual character; this kind of knowledge, is experienced and not merely taught:—"the secret of the Lord is with them that fear him:"—if ye do the will, ye shall know the doctrine; it shall grow into a part of your convictions and experience,—"*I understand more than the ancients, BECAUSE I keep thy precepts.*"—(Ps. cxix. 100.) On the other hand, why had not men an ear to hear the Saviour? How was it, that seeing they saw not, and hearing did not understand? It was because the word of God, was of none effect through their traditions: because not being accustomed to listen unto God, they had lost all sense of the harmony of his voice; and by following senseless traditions, had become senseless;—stupefied in natural faculties, and hardened in spiritual sensibilities. But God gives an ear to hear, an understanding whereby to judge; and if this be kept open, and employed on his truth, it becomes the avenue to still further knowledge.

"If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me,"—and if we continue in iniquity, in spite of his warnings, then we shall not hear the Lord: the same course stops his ears against our prayers, and our minds against his instructions and entreaties. When his voice breaks through the stoppages and fences of our passions, and fastens on the conscience,—that is a crisis in our history, the true "tide in the affairs of men," and if we turn at his reproof, and seek pardon at the cross of his Son, his word gains free course along the avenues to our souls, and will dwell in us richly, in all wisdom and understanding: but if we beat back these approaches, and plunge deeper into sin or forgetfulness, we thus commence that searedness of conscience,—which results from doing despite to the spirit of grace;—a second life of sin, on higher grounds, and against better light;—not the light of the age, but a light from heaven—the true light; which came into the world to *enlighten every man*.

"It was Adam's doom," says Dr. South, "to return to the earth, and his soul fell to the ground first:"—(sermon on Deut. xxix. 4.)—but as when God had curiously fashioned the body, and it lay breathless on the ground, he then breathed into it the breath of life, and by inspiration, gave an understanding soul: so now that the soul has fallen,—prostrate on the earth, by reason of forgetting God, it is only a divine remembrancer, that can raise the soul from that prone condition; as by a second and higher exercise of wisdom and creative power—the inspiration of the Almighty giveth understanding, by means of that word, whose entrance giveth life.

This is the true standard, the touchstone divinely provided—not man's authority over us; not a test supplied by the growth of human traditions; but the light which "*maketh manifest*"—which distinguisheth the true nature of all things, and is to be employed by private judgment as the test of ourselves and of others.

II.

PRIEST'S RELIGION.

HUMAN AUTHORITY AND INVENTION *versus* CONSCIENCE AND THE BIBLE.

The Scriptures are the only standard of Christian faith and practice: every one is at liberty to examine them; but no one is at liberty to decline this examination: and though we may receive the help of others, we may not rest on their authority, (which is man-worship;) nor receive as religion, what is not in the Scriptures, (which is will-worship.)

KORAH, DATHAN, AND ABIRAM.

THE TABLES TURNED.

THE history contained in the book of Numbers (chap. xvi. 1—40.) of the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, against Moses and Aaron, or rather against God, whose instruments alone they professed to be;—and of the awful punishment inflicted on the impious offenders by the sudden and supernatural intervention of the divine wrath, was doubtless intended by the Holy Spirit to be had in everlasting remembrance. For “the censers of these sinners against their own souls,” were by the express command of Jehovah, made into broad plates for a covering to the altar, “to be a memorial unto the children of Israel, that no stranger which is not of the seed of Aaron come near to offer incense before the Lord, that he be not as Korah and his company.” And that this striking lesson was not designed for the Jewish dispensation alone, is manifest from the reference made to it in the Epistle of Jude (v. 11.) even were it not certain that as we are reminded by Paul, (1 Cor. x. 11.) *all* the Old Testament facts “were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.” No Christian therefore can allow himself to be so far misled by the malicious zest and unction, *not* of the Holy One, with which this inspired narrative has in every age been perverted by dominant hierarchical factions, to their unclean ends, from Cyprian in the third century, down to the fanatical Puseyite priest, the mock-evangelical curate, or the sanctimonious popeling of Methodism in the nineteenth, as to pass it over with neglect. We are Apostolically forewarned of men who *wrest* the Scriptures to their own destruction. The rather therefore is it our duty in this, as in all similar cases, to endeavour to ascertain the simple truth, whose wilful or unconscious abuse has generated the misapplication. Moreover, a moment's reflection will convince us that if our cause be good, it cannot but be immensely to its advantage to do so. No Scripture, when fairly examined, *can* afford the least foot-

hold to any unscriptural notion. For the Bible is an undivided whole, like the seamless robe of Christ. It consists of parts, but not of fragments, so that "whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." If therefore the enemies of divine truth are ever allowed to shelter themselves behind the Ægis of Revelation, her friends must be to blame. Never should the foe be so hotly pursued as when in his presumptuous infatuation he seeks to hide beneath the thick bosses of the Almighty's buckler. There is a profound truth contained in the dogma of Rome, that the Scriptures are the inalienable dowry of the Church, and may never be cited against her. This must even necessarily hold good of that Church which is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. The ark carried in triumph into the temple of Dagon,* always shivers the idol whose glorification the Philistines mean it to subserve.

On these grounds an enlightened Christian man, far from feeling any sympathy with the too common pastime of bandying texts from one side to another of a controversy; childishly counting their number, measuring their lengths, weighing their respective merits one against another, and so striking an illusory balance of inspired authority, he will rather give especial heed precisely to those passages which may be alleged against the view that commends itself on the most impartial consideration, to his religious consciousness. For he will not doubt that so far as his conviction accords with the mind of the One Spirit of God, those vouchers that are tendered to him whether in good or in bad faith, in behalf of an opposite conclusion, can possess only a simulated validity. And in following this course he will not seldom be rewarded by the discovery how completely error herself is held in check by the strong hand of Providence, and how by virtue of a mysterious fatality she can never handle the two-edged sword of the Spirit, without wounding herself to the death. The very texts she is fondest of quoting, are sure to be those which when thoroughly sifted will be found most fatal to her pretensions. Thus the ancient Gnostics were wont to cite, in justification of their denial of the resurrection of the body, the words "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,"—and this from the middle of the fifteenth chapter of Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians *which is wholly taken up with proving the truth which they gainsaid*. So the modern Socinians will point with triumph to our Lord's words "My Father is greater than I," as though such words from the lips of a mere man, as they represent him to have been, were not either nonsense or blasphemy: We have seen the Apostolic saying "*Every* creature of God is good, and *nothing* to be rejected if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer" alleged by a Romish bishop in defence of holy water. It would equally sanction holy batter-pudding, and is plainly as flat a denial as could be given of that very theory of *particularistic* sanctification, from which the use of holy water is a deduction. The Scribes and Pharisees appealed to the law of the Sabbath against our Saviour's *doing good* on that day, by healing the man with the withered hand, but in their blind zeal they forgot that whether the commandment

* The *Fish-god*, as the name means, suggesting the "loaves and fishes," for which some, "whose god was their belly," followed Christ.

forbade the saving of life or not, it could hardly sanction murder, of which they were guilty in their hearts when they went out of the synagogue and took counsel how they might *destroy* him. Nor will many words be needed to shew that their successors in Christian times are equally unlucky in their favourite reference, for the amiable purpose of blackening their opponents, to Korah, Dathan, and Abiram.

Of course it is very consoling to the spiritual pride of priests, to compare themselves to Moses and Aaron, and all who resist their domination, to the wretched victims of the divine displeasure. Hence the greediness with which they seize the bait, which a specious appearance of an analogy in their favour presents, little dreaming that they must thereby swallow a very jagged hook. Was not the sin of these offenders they triumphantly ask, rebellion against sacerdotal authority? And, was not the plea by which they defended their revolt, precisely that of the modern Dissenters, when they advocate a popular constitution of the Church, on the ground that "all the congregation are holy, every one of them." Thus the matter is settled, quite to their hearts content, and accordingly with an unctuous tenderness for souls, they warn all good people against the ministrations of schismatic teachers, in the words of Moses, "Depart from the tents of these wicked men and touch nothing of theirs, lest ye be consumed in all their sins." But there are two or three circumstances about the narrative which might suggest a slight misgiving. The men who make this application of it are always bragging of numbers, and twitting Dissenters with being a contemptible minority. Now the merest glance at the history will shew that the overwhelming majority was with the rebels on this occasion. "All the congregation of the children of Israel," to use the words of the narrative, were in a sense on their side, and against Moses and Aaron. This has an awkward look, since we know him who has said, "woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you; *for so did their fathers unto the false prophets,*" as e. g. when they canonized "these sinners against their own souls," Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and called them "the people of the Lord." Again, the appeal of Moses to the great Searcher of hearts, "I have not taken one ass from them, neither have I hurt one of them," ill befits the devouring mouths of a rapacious and persecuting hierarchy. The words would choke these bashful successors of the man who "was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth." Peter's primacy and Peter's sword they may deem very well, but they have at any rate never been suspected of any liking for Peter's poverty-stricken avowal, "silver and gold have I none." Priests have always been noted for being very mercenary, very merciless, and *not* very meek. This striking difference between their *character* and that of Moses, does not favour the presumption of the identity of their *cause* with his.

We are naturally emboldened by these discoveries, to look more narrowly into the pretended analogy. We are told, and most truly, that Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, gainsaid sacerdotal claims, by an assertion of the priesthood of every individual Israelite, and that Dissenters do the like. Hence it is plausibly argued, that Dissenters are guilty of their sin, and liable to their punishment. But this by no means follows, *unless we be living under the same dispensation as they.* It was precisely in

the confusion of two widely different dispensations, that the error of these men consisted. They wrested the Scripture, "ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation," (Exod. xix. 6.) which rightly understood, was a *prophecy* of what would be realized in *Christianity*, but which they in their self-will chose to treat as a fact, belonging to their own times, just because it squared best with their selfish purposes to do so. They little cared that thus interpreted, this portion of the divine testimony stood in flagrant contradiction with that other, by which the priesthood was assigned to Aaron and his sons. In this they were the fore-runners of all, *priests amongst the number*, who for paltry pelf, place and power, jumble together the different divine œconomies, and quote the Bible against the Bible. They were not the men to say with David and with Paul, "let God be true, and every man a liar." For the divine veracity they were by no means so jealous as for their own consequence. *Nor are those, who whilst pretending to be Christians make a dead letter of the glorious oracle which these wicked men abused.* That declaration must have been either prophecy, or fact. The question as to whether Korah, Dathan, and Abiram were wrong in viewing it as a fact, the dreadful judgment of God set for ever at rest. It was therefore a prediction, which is either fulfilled under the Christian dispensation, or has been falsified altogether. If it has been fulfilled, it follows that what was *wrong then, just because it was antedated, is right now*, because the fulness of time has come, and God has sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And again, what was *right then, viz., a particularistic priesthood, is, just because it is postdated, wrong now*, and those who contend for such a priesthood, are fighting against God, as much as Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. If priests disrelish this conclusion, there is no alternative for them, save to deny the fulfilment of the prophecy, i. e. to join their friends the Jews in still expecting the coming of the Messiah, and thus making God a liar, by disbelieving the record which he hath given concerning his Son. Even then, however, they will still have to settle it with their circumcised and Levitical allies how they, *who are strangers and not of the seed of Aaron*, dare, after the example of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, to invade the sacerdotal office. From this ugly dilemma there is for priests no possible escape. And on either horn they are impaled as the genuine and undoubted successors of—Korah, Dathan, and Abiram.

On the other hand, if priests will still persist in classing Reformers with Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, for affirming in Christian times, what these men under a totally different though preparatory dispensation, alleged fifteen centuries too early, they unwittingly do us the highest honour. For they do but associate us with the "glorious company of the Apostles," whilst the ribaldry they mean for us, lights on those heads on which

the Spirit came,
And sat like tongues of cloven flame.

For the Apostles everywhere most strenuously assert the claims of the universal Christian priesthood, and thus utterly overthrow the impious pretensions of all human mediators whatsoever. Thus John declares that

Christ "hath loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and *hath made* us kings and priests to God and his Father."—(Rev. i. 5.) And Peter, alluding to the very passage abused by Korah, Dathan, and Abiram; says, "*Ye are* a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation."—(1 Pet. ii. 9.) And he that despiseth Apostles will not stick to despise also Him that sent them, who defended his disciples for plucking the ears of corn on the Sabbath, by claiming for all in communion with Himself, the dignity of the priests who in the temple profaned the Sabbath and were blameless.

Thus the priest's malice recoils upon himself. In the pit which he hath digged is his own foot taken. His charitable endeavour to fasten upon his more honest neighbours the guilt of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, ends in his being convicted of it himself. By shouting "stop thief" rather too zealously, the ingenious pickpocket at last succeeds in turning towards his own felon countenance the inconvenient suspicions of the crowd. It is the priest who imitates the ancient heresiarchs, by jumbling together two different dispensations, and shifting so cunningly the point of view to suit his sinister ambition or base hankering after lucre. It is *he*, who just as in days of old, Korah, Dathan, and Abiram revolted against Moses the faithful servant over God's house, and Aaron the typical priest; so now amidst the glare of gospel times stirs up rebellion against the Son over his own House, and Him who is called of God an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek. For who is it that grudges Christ the glory of being the sole prophet in his Church, and who bat-like would supplement his sun-bright teaching by the flickering taper of tradition, if not the priest? Who is it that eyes with devilish lust the honours of the One Mediator between God and men, if not the priest? Who is it in fine but the priest that will treasonably pluck at the blood-bought crown-rights of the Redeemer, and will pawn them to the Cæsar if, perchance (so shocked are the ungodly themselves at the unseemliness of the assumption,) he cannot have his way in wearing them as pope, on his own sodden brow. None, if not priests, have ever loved the wages of unrighteousness. None, if not they, have ever trodden in the steps of the first murderer, and run in danger of hell-fire for breaking the sixth commandment, as we learn it from the lips of our Lord, by calling their Christian brethren fools, unfit to have a voice in the affairs of God's kingdom. For they rob the whole laity of that hallowed life in Christ's Church which, to any but an Esau ought to be deemed far more precious than mere animal existence. And none, if not priests, impugn Christ's prophetic, priestly, and kingly dignity in his Church, thus aggravating to gigantic proportions the comparatively venial sin of those who "envied Moses in the camp, and Aaron the saint of the Lord." It is their concern therefore to look to the words of Jude, "Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Korah!"

III.

STATESMEN'S RELIGION.

"EVERY PLANT WHICH MY HEAVENLY FATHER HATH NOT PLANTED, SHALL BE ROOTED UP."—(Matt. xv. 13.)

In those who think a national Church right, dissent is a sin ; in those who think it wrong, silence is a shame.

MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN ;

OR,

THE HANDWRITING *over against the candlestick*, IN THE ARCHBISHOP'S PALACE.

IN TIMES of change, commotion, or uncertainty, it is naturally expected that they who are on the high places and watch-towers of Church and State, shall see far and wide, look before and after, and become the beacon-lights of those over whom they officially preside. This is the meaning and purport of, or pretext for, their office itself. *The divine right of any Government arises from the usefulness of it.* That which God institutes, he renders available ; as everything which he creates is plainly adapted to some useful end.

There is no member of our bodies which we could lose without disadvantage ; and so it is with any organization, truly called the body of Christ, his Church. If therefore, episcopacy or pre-eminence termed prelacy be of divine institution, its use will be its proof and defence. The loss of it would be the maiming of the Church ; the possession of it would be a manifest blessing.

Where then is the blessedness they boast of, where the security and guidance of this episcopal oversight ?

Do our Most Reverend and Right Reverend Prelates, the Lord Archbishops and Lord Bishops of the Church of England, (placed in honour and wealth by the secular Government) prove themselves to be any signal blessing to the clergy and laity of their communion, in the present crisis ? This is a question of fact which plain men may understand—what is the precise benefit resulting to the people of England from the lofty titles, legislative functions, spiritual duties, and wealthy estates conferred by the secular power on the English bishops ?

Do they stand forth as the lights of the age, shining in a dark place ; can each one of them say—" *I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame?*"—(Job. xxix. 15.)

Have these bishops any peculiar insight into truth, are they not bound

down to licensed formularies,—truths or falsehoods ready found for them? Must they not say with BALAAM, (changing *only one word*,) “HAVE I NOW ANY POWER AT ALL TO SAY ANYTHING? *The word that GOVERNMENT putteth in my mouth, THAT shall I speak.*—(Num. xxii. 38.) Only Balaam must speak the word that GOD put into his mouth; and hence Balak with true royal supremacy, as the head of his national Church, was angry with Balaam, and said,—“*Therefore, now flee thou to thy place: I thought to promote thee unto great honour; but lo THE LORD THY GOD HATH KEPT THEE BACK FROM HONOUR.*”—(Num. xxiv. 11.)

The author of the gospel likewise kept back his followers from such promotion, they were to be rewarded by him whose word they declared and followed. “His servants ye are to whom ye obey,” and to him you must look for your wages.

Thus doth the Lord our God keep us back from much honour, as we are to follow our conscience illuminated by the light of his gospel; whilst those who will barter it for worldly dignities, get promoted to *high places of spiritual obedience to Government*, under the pretence of a spiritual oversight of their dioceses.

The bishops are consequently servants, not rulers; they have a prescribed set of duties, defined by the laws, to which laws they are amenable; the supremacy of the crown is the subserviency of the bishops. Should they exercise any discretionary power, or even a jurisdiction supported by the letter of the Church’s law, the Privy Council can open a door into any diocese, by means of a latitude of construction.

The true episcopate is therefore the secular Government, which presides over the bishops. Any person who can read, and write, and spell, could go blamelessly through the mechanical duties of a bishopric; they require neither piety, learning, genius, nor extraordinary discretion.

The highest offices and largest salaries in England, require only the qualifications of the commonest clerkship; and might be fulfilled by a decent errand boy.*

The rule of another profession, would be an infallible guide in this:—“and let those that play your clowns, *speak no more than is set down for them.*”—(Hamlet.)

This is plain and easy sailing. Accordingly we find the archbishops and bishops of the provinces of Canterbury and York, issuing directions to the clergy of England, to keep the mean between the ritual of the Church and the canon of actual usage,—as the way to compose difference and *right* the crazy vessel in which they are embarked. Never was a more complete specimen of timidity, narrowness, and inanity, than in the address issued by these dignitaries on the third (instead of the first) day of April, 1851.

Declining to grapple with any great questions of religions truth or national policy, these men advise a free nation respecting the man-millinery of clerical costumes, the trimming of the ecclesiastical beard, the posi-

* Some will perhaps object that at least the *legislative* functions of the bishops require a greater amount of ability: we are not sure of this; since they have only to say “*content*,” and “*non-content*,” which being uttered alternately, without reference to the nature of the bill, would equal episcopal performances.

tion and number of footlights in this spiritual theatre; that by ecclesiastical architecture and decorations they may "edify the body of Christ." Their grand panacea for all evils, is to prove their fitness as "stewards of the mysteries of God," by their exactness of concord in the mummies of men.

This tame and waterish production, the condensed wisdom of four-and-twenty bishops, is here presented to our readers; and their eyes are better than ours if they can discern in it either spirit, or wisdom, or eloquence; any one quality indicative of manly earnestness or Christian principle;—anything beyond the logic of a pettyfogging special pleader, engaged in episcopal trimming to "*strengthen the side of order*," (not of truth,) "by avoiding all *unnecessary* (!) deviation from *the Church's rule*." Not the rule of Christ, but the rule of a *figment called the Church*; which Church, the Church is called upon to obey!

"We the undersigned Archbishops and Bishops of the provinces of Canterbury and York, do most earnestly and affectionately commend the following address to the serious consideration of the clergy of our respective dioceses:

"J. B. CANTUAR,
"T. EBOR,
"C. J. LONDON,
"E. DUNELM,
"C. R. WINTON,
"J. LINCOLN,
"C. BANGOR,
"H. CARLISLE,
"G. ROCHESTER,
"J. H. GLOCESTER
AND BRISTOL,
"C. T. RIPON,
"E. SARUM,

"G. PETERBOROUGH,
"C. ST. DAVID'S,
"H. WORCESTER,
"A. T. CICESTER,
"J. LICHFIELD,
"T. ELEY,
"S. OXON,
"T. V. ST. ASAPH,
"J. CHESTER,
"S. NORWICH,
"A. LLANDAFF,
"AUCKLAND, SODOR
AND MAN.

"BELOVED BRETHREN,—We have viewed with the deepest anxiety the troubles, suspicions, and discontents which have of late, in some parishes, accompanied the introduction of ritual observances, *exceeding those in common use amongst us*.

"We long indulged the hope that, under the influence of charity, forbearance, and a calm estimate of the small importance of such external forms, compared with the blessing of united action in the great spiritual work which is before our Church, these heats and jealousies might by mutual concessions be allayed. But since the evil still exists, and in one most important feature has assumed a new and more dangerous character, *we feel that it is our duty to try whether an earnest and united address on our part may tend*, under the blessing of God, to promote the restoration of peace and harmony in the Church.

"The principal point in dispute is this—*whether, where the letter of the Rubric seems to warrant a measure of ritual observance, which yet, by long and possibly by unbroken practice, has not been carried out, the clergy are either in conscience required, or absolutely at liberty, to act each upon his own view of the letter of the precept rather than by the rule of common practice*. Now, as to this question we would urge upon you the following considerations:—*First*, that *any change of usages with which the religious feelings of a congregation have become associated, is in itself so likely to do harm that it is not to be introduced without the greatest caution*; *secondly*, that beyond this, any change which makes it *difficult for the congregation at large to join in the service* is still more to be avoided; *thirdly*, that *any change which suggests the fear of still further alterations is most injurious*; and *fourthly*, that *according to the rule laid down in the Book of Common Prayer, where anything is doubted or diversely taken 'concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute the things contained in that book, the parties that so doubt, or diversely take anything, shall always resort to the Bishop of the diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same, so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in that book*.

"The *fair application* of these principles would, we believe, solve most of the difficulties which have arisen. It would *prevent all sudden and startling alterations*; and it would *facilitate the reception of any change* which was *really lawful and desirable*. We would, therefore, first urge upon our *reverend brethren with affectionate earnestness* the adoption of such a rule of conduct. We would beseech all *who*, whether by excess or defect, have broken in upon the uniformity and *contributed to relax the authority of our ritual observances*, to consider the importance of unity and order, and by common consent to avoid whatever might tend to violate them. In recommending this course as the best under present circumstances, we do not shut our eyes to the *evil of even the appearance of any discrepancy existing between the written law and the practice of the Church*. But there are many cases where the law may be variously interpreted; and we believe that we are best carrying out her own principles in *urging you to have recourse, in all such cases, to the advice of her Chief Pastors*.

"But beyond mere attempts to restore an unusual strictness of ritual observance, we have to deal with a distinct and serious evil. A principle has of late been avowed and acted on which, if admitted, would justify far greater and more uncertain changes. It is this—that as the Church of England is the ancient Catholic Church settled in this land before the Reformation, and was then reformed only by the casting away of *certain strictly defined corruptions*; therefore, whatever form or usage existed in the Church before its reformation *may now be freely introduced and observed*, unless there can be alleged against it the distinct letter of some formal prohibition.

"Now, against any such inference from the *undoubted identity of the Church before and after the Reformation*, we feel bound to enter our clear and unhesitating protest. We believe that at the Reformation the English Church not only rejected certain corruptions but also, without in any degree severing her connection with the ancient Catholic Church, intended to establish one uniform ritual, according to which her public services should be conducted. But it is manifest that a *license such as is contended for is wholly incompatible with any uniformity of worship whatsoever, and at variance with the universal practice of the Catholic Church*, which has never given to the officiating ministers of separate congregations any such large discretion in the selection of ritual observances.

"We therefore beseech any one who may have proposed to *themselves* the restoration of what, under sanction of this principle, they deemed a lawful system, to consider the dangers which it involves; to see it in its true light, and to *take a more just and sober view of the real position of our Church*; whilst, with equal earnestness, we beseech others, who, either by intentional omission, or by neglect and laxity, may have disturbed the uniformity and weakened the authority of our prescribed ritual, to strengthen the side of order by *avoiding all unnecessary deviation from the Church's rule*.

"Such harmony of action we are persuaded would, under God's blessing, go far towards restoring the peace of the Church. This happy result would more clearly exhibit her *spiritual* character. The mutual relations of her various members would be more distinctly perceived; and our *lay brethren would more readily acknowledge* the special trust committed to us, as stewards of the *mysteries of God*, 'for the edifying of the Body of CHRIST.' They would join with us in asserting, and, if need be, defending for themselves, as much as for us, the true spiritual freedom of the Church. They would unite with us in a more trustful spirit, and therefore with a more ready will, in enlarging her means and strengthening her powers for the great work she has to do amongst the swarming multitudes of our great towns at home, and of our vast dominions abroad; and that Church which has so long received from the hands of God such unequalled blessings, might continue to be, *yea, and become more and more 'a praise in the earth.'*"

Will this then remove all disquietudes, cast new light on perplexed questions, settle the creed of the nation, and give stability to the Church? Are the wants of the age so very slight, as to be sufficiently supplied by covering men with these ecclesiastical rags? Surely this production is more worthy an advertisement of Hyam's Pantechnetheca, than an assembly of most Reverend, and Right Reverend Fathers in God.

"The principal point in dispute is, whether the letter of the Rubric or common practice, is binding on the conscience of the clergy, or whether each is at liberty to act upon his own views" of ritual observances. And

is *this* all, most grave and reverend seniors; have you no conception of any other point in dispute but this Jewish cry about "Aaron's wardrobe,"—"OLD CLO!"

Can you think of no change serious enough to affect the Rubric itself,—establishing the rule of Christ, instead of "the Church's rule?" Is there no alternative, but the Rubric and the common practice, a name for violations of the Rubric, or the Church's rule?

Their lordships cannot be insensible of the wound here inflicted on the Church as practically existing, since it is a confessed violation of the Rubric on which the Church is partly founded.

Thus do they allow to the Puseyites the full acknowledgment of legal propriety, and condemn all others as having departed from the law, whilst with gravity they discuss the importance of not suddenly returning to it; yet not "unnecessarily" departing from it.

Will their lordships next inform the clergy *whether if common practice annuls the law respecting observances, common preaching might also annul the creeds and articles?* And whether consequently evangelical doctrines are not an innovation on the long established orthodoxy of the Church; and therefore equally to be avoided with Puseyite practices.

"We do not shut our eyes," their lordships declare, "to the evil of even the appearance of any discrepancy *between the written law and the practice of the Church.*" But which Church do they mean? Is the practising Church, the same as the legislating Church, whose written laws are violated in practice? There is considerable confusion here, from the strange and undefined use of the term Church, under which mystical vagueness, inconsistencies are more easily hidden or palliated.

But what right have these bishops to undervalue one part of the Church's written laws rather than another? Can the same spiritual lords be ignorant of the fact, that their fourth rule for deciding difficulties, namely appealing to the bishops, (according to the command of the Prayer Book, with which the clergy might be acquainted without this address)—that this is a great difficulty in itself? Could Gorham appeal to his bishop? Could the bishop *decide*, if he *had* so appealed?

Has not the Bishop of London himself *decided variously according to the pressure of the times?* If then the clergy differ from their bishops, if the bishops vary as the wind blows, and if one bishop differs from another, where is the settlement by this furbishing up the Prayer Book direction—an appeal to the bishop?

Perhaps his Lordship of London when signing the above address, had forgotten the following reply to the memorialists of St. Paul's Chapel, in *defence of his orders to introduce Puseyite practices*:—"with respect to the second alteration, (giving out the singing Psalms by the officiating clergyman) its advantage in point of propriety and *decency* (!) *as well as of CONFORMITY TO THE RUBRIC* is so obvious, that I need not offer any remark upon it." At this date in his lordship's history, a conformity to the Rubric was becoming; now, conformity to *practice*, is urged for the sake of union.

The moderate trimming between law and usage in the address given above, is very different to the animadversion of his lordship to the memorialists of St. Paul's Chapel;—"upon the whole, I trust the memorialists

will, upon reflection, recognize **THE DUTY OF A COMPLIANCE on the part of the clergy, WITH THE PLAIN DIRECTIONS OF THAT LAW WHICH THEY HAVE SOLEMNLY PROMISED TO OBSERVE.**"*

At present, however, the same bishop has agreed with others to acknowledge that the practice differs from "the plain directions of that law which they have solemnly promised to observe;" but from which they are emancipated by their constant practise of violating their sacred promise!

This is the clear and steady light shed upon the dubious path of the clergy, from the wondrous constellation of episcopal dignitaries.

And in this we see what they intend by "**THE UNDOUBTED IDENTITY OF THE CHURCH BEFORE AND AFTER THE REFORMATION:**"—*they are Romanists still* in the great principle of human traditions, and the practise of rites that God has not commanded nor sanctioned!

But, if the Church be "undoubtedly the same before and after the Reformation," why all the outcry respecting the Papal Aggression? If the Church of Rome be a true Church, why is she repudiated as the scarlet lady; if she be a false Church, and the English be *undoubtedly identical*—they are both false together.

ARE THESE BISHOPS JESUITS, paving the way for union with Rome, by denying that there has been any real separation? If they be Protestants, they are stultified; if Jesuits, they are consistent.

So pur-blind are these leaders that they are afraid of losing the link of their connexion with Christ through history and official descent, hence will own themselves branches of a false Church, identical with the communion they depart from. They see not that we are related to Christ through faith, and not through historical hierarchies;—by our present communion with himself, not by hands linked with hereditary Pharisees from Apostolic times till now. They aim to save their ecclesiasticalism by becoming or pretending to be, branches of a Church, instead of branches of the true vine. So Rome is their mother, though also by them called the mother of harlots, the mother of abominations! Wherefore ye be witnesses against yourselves, that ye are the children of one whose offspring is an abomination.

"The undoubted identity of the Church before and after the Reformation," is a Jesuit's text provided by the established hierarchy of England. It may also become the Reformer's text, to preach up (not a return in name to what the Church is identical with, in spirit and character but,) a complete reformation in which there shall be no such spurious and illegitimate issue.

Men may be saved in the Roman Catholic Church, but never can be saved by that Church; it is only by a miracle of grace, leading to a recognition of Christ in the midst of popish mummeries, that Romanists can be saved. "We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat, which serve the tabernacle," who offer sacrifices over again, and so deny him who was offered once for all: *these additions to Christ, are an abandonment of his sufficiency*; putting priests vulgarly called "the Church's rule" and ceremonies in the Redeemer's place: this is falling

* Correspondence between the congregation of St. Paul's Chapel and the Bishop of London. May, 1843.

from grace, being saved by man's law, or anything besides the Saviour. *And therefore Rome is not a Church, but a huge combined apostacy.*

What then shall we say of "the undoubted identity of the Church before and after the Reformation?"

Behold the wise taken in their own craftiness: this was the downward progress of the heathen world, leaving the light which God had shewed unto them, for inventions and fancies; so "professing themselves to be wise they became fools. And this wisdom which seeks a hold of the chain of tradition, will drag those who cling to it into the vortex of Rome.

Have these Right Reverend Fathers in God, no Bibles,—no copies of the word of God, by which they may emancipate themselves and their clergy from this scholastico-ecclesiastical bondage, to a vague idea of Church identity?

Then let them descend from this position of lordship, that out of the mouth of babes and sucklings the praise of Christ may be perfected.

Dr. South the best defender of episcopal dignity, points out in his sermon on the duties of the episcopal functions, those circumstances which would justly bring the bishops into contempt: one of these is *ignorance*;—"If (he says) men will be ignorant and illiterate, let them be so in private and to themselves; and not set their defects in a high place, to make them visible and conspicuous. If owls will not be hooted at, let them keep close within the tree, and not perch upon the upper boughs."

He evidently supposes this possible; and late events seem to render it more than probable, namely, palpable.

Such then should retire from the day-light of this age, and not bring their smoky torch-lights to guide those who are visited with "the day-spring from on high."

When churchmen look up with anxious eyes to their bishops to allay feverish anxieties, behold how they are fed with the chaff of delusion,—a solemn and affectionate appeal on the observances of the Rubric! This is the scandal of our age, as well as of the episcopal bench; of our age, for retaining such a costly and worn out spiritual supervisorship. What man is there whom if his son ask bread will he give him a stone? But will these Rubrical ordinances be more satisfying to the spiritual hunger of the people? And this is the ineffable blessing of spiritual court guides maintained at a vast expense to preserve the Church in purity and splendour!

We have but to wait for some occasion, wherein their wisdom and abilities may be displayed, (occasions for which true genius and capability are ever waiting and equipt,) and discover the form without the power;—shew and pomp without inherent dignity.

"For thou dost know, O Damon dear,
This Realm dismantled was
Of Jove Himself; and now reigns here
A very, very—Peacock."*

Whose head hath no wisdom, his voice no music,—whose only ornament is in his tail; a fine bird made of fine feathers; who has only to articulate in order to be discovered. Whether we can afford such ornaments, when we discover them to be nothing more, is a question for the financial Reformers.

* Hamlet.

But the imbecility of the advice given by our bishops, is not more pitiable, than the weakness of supplication by which these spiritual rulers "*beseech*" any one "to see it in its true light," and "to take a more just and sober view of the position of our Church." That position is humiliating enough, and just views of it, as afforded by the bishops may well be "sober" ones. For here the guidance given is "not *unnecessarily* to deviate from the Church's rule." So that *some* departure is judged necessary, and the clergyman is left in uncertainty on "the principal point in dispute:" whilst the bishops have confessedly no power, no jurisdiction, no real authority, they can resort only to supplication!

How very different this actual state of things, from the *boasted advantages of* EPISCOPAL RULE, some centre of authority and appeal to preserve unity, order, and subordination. We have only to compare the grandiloquence of the theory with the real live episcopacy;—addressing the clergy with tears, and as some bishops have acknowledged, altogether in vain!

Whereunto then shall we liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the market place, saying, we have piped and ye have not danced; we have mourned and ye have not lamented.

The order and obedience, the safe guidance and efficient defence of the theoretical bishopric as set down in South's sermons, will form a grotesque contrast to this "sober" reality.

In his sermon "preached at Lambeth Chapel, Nov. 25, 1666, upon the consecration of the Right Rev. Father in God, Dr. John Dolben, Lord Bishop of Rochester," published by command of "my Lord of Canterbury;" the duties and authority of bishops are set forth at large. These duties were to *teach* and to *rule*, to "rebuke with all authority."

Respecting teaching he observes, that "*men never go on so cheerfully as when they see where they go.*" This maxim would have been of service had our hierarchy acted upon it in the address lately issued: at present they seem to have fulfilled "the teaching part of a Romish bishop, whose grand business is only to teach men to be ignorant, to instruct them how to know nothing."

But Dr. South's bishop is to teach by means of others, *APPOINTING fit men*, and enforcing their performance of duty: now it is very well known that our bishops *appoint none*, and can refuse none: nor can we "thank God" with this author, that our "bishops are able to silence the factions no less by their preaching than by their authority;" for our bishops preach very little, and have no authority at all.

Comparatively it is now out of date to say a "bishop does his Church, his prince, and country, more service by ruling other men's tongues than by employing his own." The best service the bishop's could do to the Church at present, would be to rule their own tongues, and especially to deliver as few addresses to the clergy as possible.

There are three ingredients in the ruling power of the theoretical bishop: first, "exaction of duty," seeing that the clergy shall not "*mince and mangle that in their practice, WHICH THEY COULD SWALLOW WHOLE IN THEIR SUBSCRIPTIONS.*" But this is now openly recommended by the bench of bishops!

2. This theoretical rule implies the "protection and encouragement of

persons in the discharge of their duty:" bishops in reality cannot even do this; they may give their official preferments to favourites and relations; but their power extends no further.

3. "The third thing implied in Government is coercion, and animadversion upon such as neglect their duty; *without which coercive power, all Government is but toothless and precarious, and does not so much command as beg obedience.*"

This beggary is exactly the condition of the present "chief pastors" or *governors* of the Church. "We therefore beseech any one, &c."

Amongst the just causes of contempt towards Church governors, our author mentions (in addition to ignorance already noticed)—"fearfulness of, and mean compliance with, bold popular offenders. Some indeed count it policy and prudence, where men refuse to come up to a law, to make the law come down to them."

This is the exact method of our present bishops, in their balancing between law and practice; therefore according to South and the high authorities at whose pleasure he published,—our present bishops are "justly despised."

The same court preacher has left on record another sermon, also preached at the consecration of a bishop;* the text and the sermon furnish an apt contrast to the reality of bishops as they are found in these degenerate times.

"I will make thee unto this people a fenced brazen wall: and they shall fight against thee, but they shall not prevail against thee; for I am with thee to save and deliver thee."—(Jer. xv. 20.)

Whilst admitting that neither Doctor Seth Ward, nor the English bishop were the person mentioned in the text, and refusing to deduce episcopacy from Judaism, he yet finds there the principle of authority, and an exact parallel between "Jeremy as a Church governor, and a bishop." Bishops were also in Jeremy's case persecuted from prison to prison, (this parallel does not always hold) and could appropriate his complaint, "I have wronged no man, I have neither lent on usury, nor have men lent me on usury, *and yet every man curses me.*"

On the first point, "God's qualification of Jeremy for his charge,—I will make thee a brazen fenced wall," he observes that "a wall imports two things, enclosure and fortification."

The enclosure he discovers to be of advantage, because "commons are always bare, pilled and shorn, as the sheep that feed upon them."

But this observation is made for the sake of the pastors, who here are strangely the sheep, and turn to grazing, instead of being graziers. The enclosure is to preserve the offices and revenues of the Church from "a butcher, &c., who [like many validly ordained bishops] enjoys the fair translation from the killing of one flock to the feeding of another." Now to defend the pasturage for the sake of the pastors, "to stave off the profane intrusions of the rabble for the future, we must have an enclosure, and a hedge will not serve the turn. *So many rotten stakes of lay-governors will not raise a fence.*" He forgot that in the real Church of England these rotten stakes are the governors of the bishops, to whom he gives the office, not of defending the flock, but preserving the fleece;

* Dr. Seth Ward, Bishop of Oxon.

an enclosure, not to defend, but to fight against the people, and here his theory agrees with modern practice. Still he rejects the rotten stakes. "No; *one brazen wall, one diocesan bishop will better defend the Church,*" i.e. the revenues, "than all the quicksets of Geneva."

So the bishop is with him a "*brazen enclosure,*" a safe depository for Church property.

But secondly, this "wall imports *fortification:* . . . something must encircle the Church that will both *discriminate and protect it.* And the altar must be railed in, not only for distinction, but defence. *And such a thing* is a Church governor, a well qualified bishop. It is *he* that must secure the Church, and not *the little inferior pastors about him.*"

But *now* the bishops cannot "rail in the altar," but are exposed to be *railed at* for their inefficiency, in being unable even to control "the little inferior pastors about them." They are a *brazen wall*, but not a "fenced" wall.

This metaphor is further applied to Church rulers, in that *courage* is required; for a wall must be "well manned." "But he that is flexible, apt to decline opposition when he can; and when he cannot, to yield to it, will be jaded and rid like an ass; and *like a pitcher, he will be took and emptied by his own handle.*" Our present bishops, though thus flexible, and "betraying their charge in the very undertaking it," are not liable to be emptied in this way, being (as their humble address betrays) empty already.

The second required to complete this brazen metaphor, is "courage and integrity." "A brazen wall admits of no cracks and flaws." The consistency of our bishops in the exercise of their ruling functions, is too notorious for observation.

"The third and last qualification that I shall mention, is authority. It is to be a *fenced* as well as a brazen wall: the inward firmness must be corroborated by *exterior munitions.*" . . . "Courage is like a giant with his hands tied, if it has not authority and jurisdiction to draw forth and actuate its resolution." . . . "*But thanks be to God,* that our Church has *not only its jurisdiction from Christ,** but also [which is better,] a *superadded OVERPLUS OF CONFIRMATION from the secular power,* which has *PIOUSLY* and *prudently* provided those laws which will certainly heal up her breaches, if they be executed, &c."

It must be admitted that this is a seeming departure from the text, making Government the fenced; and bishops the brazen wall: though speaking without a figure, Government provides the brass as well as the defence; not only in making or creating bishops, who are the figurative enclosure; but in finding the pay which is the real enclosure. Whilst the fence of "piously provided" penal laws, is partially removed; and hence "God" is no longer to "be thanked" for "the superadded over-plus of confirmation" prudently afforded in a Government "Commission."

Therefore these Church governors must take another method, having now no real jurisdiction: and so are unable to profit by the following Church-militant advice.

* He does not say in what chapter and verse;—perhaps in Paul's lost parchments. Query—Is not the phrase, "thanks be to God," a natural mis-print for thanks be to Government?

"Does it become a man, with a sword by his side to beseech; or a governor armed with authority to entreat? He that thinks to win obstinate schismatics by condescension; and to conjure away those evil spirits with the softer lays and music of persuasion, may as David in a like case, have a javelin flung at his head for his pains, and perhaps escape it as narrowly."

How are the mighty fallen, how is episcopacy shorn of its power, since bishops have now to *entreat* and often vainly, that their canonically obedient clergy, would "form just and sober notions," and not "*unnecessarily* depart" from what they have solemnly promised,—"*obedience to the Church's rule.*"

The bishops can neither define nor enforce the duties of their clergy; and therefore their office is a solemn farce; a costly and unnecessary sham. They are no brazen wall; but a mud wall through which enquiry is digging; a wall which of itself is opening into cracks and chinks; which is beginning to be felt as an obstruction rather than a defence; and must be taken down in order to widen the road for the march of human progress.

God hath providentially tested and WEIGHED THE BISHOPS of England IN THE SCALES OF THIS CRISIS, that he may write in characters legible to all men;—"TEKEL—thou art weighed in the balances and art found wanting."—(Daniel v. 27.)

IV.

SCEPTICS' RELIGION.

Under this department, sceptical objections, and systems or principles advocated as hostile to Christianity, are dispassionately considered.

PASSAGES IN THE LIFE OF AN ENQUIRER.

CHAP. I.

Behold! we know not anything;
I can but trust that good shall fall
At last—far off—at last, to all,
And every winter change to spring.
So runs my dream; but what am I?
An infant crying in the night;
An infant crying for the light;
And with no language but a cry.—*Tennyson.*

THE words of our motto are the utterance of hope struggling through bewilderment towards confidence. They express the condition of our enquirer's mind at the period when you, courteous reader, are about to make his acquaintance. Hereby we introduce him without further ceremony;—his name, Roger Fenton;—his age, five-and-twenty;—his occupation, that of a worker in silver, a cunning engraver of graceful ornaments in the precious metal;—his present residence, Dantzic, a fine old city on the shores of the Baltic, once one of the famous Hanse Towns, now a part of the Prussian dominions. The Dantzicans have long enjoyed a thriving trade in corn and timber, but their manufactures are trifling compared with their commerce, and the English artisan found his expectations of success among them realized to the full. If a cup was to be presented to some energetic burgomaster, by a grateful guild, if a young merchant wished to procure a trinket for his betrothed with a device of unusual elegance, to whom should they resort but to truth-speaking, kind-hearted, hard-working Roger? Who could fashion such roses, such thistles, such oak-leaves, such vine-leaves, such flowers and figures, and fancies of all sorts, as the Englishman? Then, too, though he was somewhat cautious in making promises, if once he had passed his word that a piece of work should be ready by a certain day, he would toil himself into a fever sooner than fail in his engagement. The consequence was, that when some such decoration was imperatively required by a certain day, the German ladies would say to their husbands, "do let us have it done by that dear Herr Fenton, he never disappoints anybody." You will not be surprised to learn, therefore, that Roger, before he had been three years in Dantzic, had not only become quite at home in the German lan-

guage and in German manners, but that he had made,—what none of us can altogether do without,—friends and money.

But the friends and the money did not stand to each other in the relation of cause and effect. He had too much, unconsciously of the fact, and consciously of the man in him to become a mammon-worshipper. He was not rich enough to attract devotees of that school about himself. He made money a stout walking-stick, to secure him a fearless independence in manhood, and a something to lean on in old age;—but not a measuring reed to take the altitude of his fellows by, and to call them great or mean as they were rich or poor. There are multitudes among us whose real worship is not a whit loftier than that of the Peruvians, whose high-priest had to roll himself in gold-dust before he could perform sacrifice;—it is only such a shining one,—some gorgeous chairman of a company, some hierophant of Plutus, that our herd of mere money-getters will consent to honour. As for Roger and his two especial friends,—Erdmann, a poor and learned schoolmaster, and Ahlfeld, a poor and devout Lutheran minister,—one of them worshipped God, the other an idea, not very distinguishable from humanity itself, under the name of God; and Roger himself was just now enquiring what worship was itself, as well as what and how man ought to worship.

We shall have more to tell you about Pastor Ahlfeld, another day,—a painful example he was of pious poverty, and of such a life as that Thomas Hood hints at, when he speaks of the curate who lived “*hard by the church.*”

At present the three friends are seated together in a back parlour in Roger's house. It is a rainy summer night, and a turbulent wind from the Baltic is shaking the windows, and lashing them with rain-drops, as with a scourge. The little room is full of smoke, and no wonder, you would say, had you seen those three large meerschauams,—two of them with bowls richly ornamented with silver—Roger's workmanship and present to his friends that very day. From each holocaust of tobacco the fuming incense went up,—floated over the stout rubicund face of the schoolmaster,—above the hair of the tall spare pastor, already tipped with grey,—about the open features and well-knit frame of the English artisan, and then away towards the dark ceiling, and on a voyage of discovery along the walls and across the backs of Roger's books on his three book-shelves.

Their talk was of grave matters—on the incomprehensibility of God, and how far and in what way the finite may know the infinite. There had been a long pause, which was broken by Erdmann, who said to Roger, “Do thou think the landrail is a ventriloquist?”

The Englishman opened his eyes wide at the question, and looked the questioner full in the face in some astonishment. Ahlfeld absolutely took his pipe out of his mouth, and sat upright. One of our public meetings would have roared, Question! The German, innocent of that most useful and most misused word, merely looked at the other two, as they looked at each other, and uttered a slow “well?”

“Because,” continued Erdmann, “I heard one of those birds this morning in a meadow outside the town,—one of its notes sounded as though it were close to me, and the next instant its second cry seemed to come

from the other end of the field. Now, is it possible for the bird to run along the grass, as its habit is, at such a rate as that; or has it a faculty of ventriloquism given it, so that it is able to make its cry seem distant, and thus escape any pursuer? Our conversation reminded me of this. That idea of God—which seems at one season so close and presently again so immeasurably distant; which now we seemed almost to catch as we were talking, and which then baffled us and vanished,—does the difficulty and inapprehensibility of it lie mainly in God or in us? Is it that our hearing deceives us, being gross and finite, or is the distance in some sort real?"

Erdmann asked the question not so much for information—though he was aware that Roger had read and thought much and anxiously, as far as his opportunities went, on such questions;—as to lay open the difficulty.

"Decidedly," said the Pastor, "the difficulty lies in our hearing,—the defect is in us. 'In Him we live, and move, and have our being.'"

"Very well then," replied the schoolmaster, "does not that show that we must give up all attempt to *know* the infinite? He is not an object of knowledge, he is only an object of feeling. Our intuition discerns him, our understanding can never rise above the logical premises of the finite."

"So I should be inclined to think," said Roger, "but one thing stands in my way. Why should reason—that noble faculty—have been given us, if not to be used for the noblest purpose, to be directed to the loftiest object, and to themes most worthy of it?"

"Good," said Ahlfeld, "does God give man reason, as a falchion to a hero, and is the said hero to employ the weapon of heavenly temper to cut cabbages—only about his mere earthly needs—and not rather wield it against the enchanter, Error, and the Giant unbelief?"

"Yes," replied Erdmann, "but this intuition I spoke of, this sensibility to the all-pervading spirit in the world, *is* reason, reason pure, in its highest exercise. This faculty does not *know*, it beholds, its perception is spiritual emotion. It is above logic."

"Who says so?" enquired Roger, whose critical temperament always led him to sift assertions.

"The understanding," answered Erdmann.

"That is to say, then," said Ahlfeld "that in religion the understanding says—'here I leave you, I abdicate.' But I cannot conceive that God is to be known or worshipped by or with any single faculty. Religion exercises all in man—God does not say to man respecting any faculty, you cannot serve me with that. I do not believe in any separate religious faculty; we seek God, and we find and serve him, with our entire nature, body, soul, and spirit."

"Yet you will acknowledge," argued Erdmann, "that the understanding cannot comprehend God."

"I do," replied Ahlfeld, "but likewise neither can your mere feeling or intuition. That is but a certain vague and vast impression. You must not confound the indefinite with the infinite."

"I see," said Roger, "where it is you split. Erdmann says, that we do not know a thing unless we entirely comprehend it."

"And I say," continued Ahlfeld, "that, on that principle, we could scarcely say we know anything. Yet no one would say that a child, who knew a circle when he saw it, did not know what a circle was, because he was unacquainted with, and could not be made to understand all the geometrical properties of a circle. He is aware of one property the circle has, roundness,—by that he knows it, as a circle, as well as though he were acquainted with it far more. Such knowledge is sufficient for his purpose. So, if we are told, on good testimony, that God is holy or good, for example, we may say we know what God is, so far, though we cannot comprehend him. We know him thus, as far as we need know him, and in the application of such knowledge, feeling, understanding, action, are all concerned."

Just at this moment a tap was heard at the door. "*Herin!*" cried Roger, and the person who had knocked, came in. It was a little boy, wet through, who held in his hand a letter. "Please Sir," said the child, "father's sent you this letter. He did not think there was one for you, but this dropped out afterwards, and he thought you would like to have it at once, so he sent me off with it directly."

"Careless fellow," muttered Roger. "Here,"—and, with the munificent reward of a *eilbergroschen*, the little fellow disappeared in a twinkling and raptures.

Roger looked at the address. It was from Louise.

(*To be continued.*)

THE MYSTIC : EMERSON.

"THE VOCATION OF THE SCHOLAR," or rather of the teacher, is much spoken of, but little appreciated. Literature, the highest vocation of man, (as ministering not to bodily wants, but to the spirit of man, its tastes, thoughts, and moral principles,) requires for itself a code of laws, that its dignity may be maintained and its purpose, accomplished.

Beyond the immediate success of any literary effort, there should be a consistent moral purpose, an honest effort to *contribute to the education of the human race*, whether in amusement, information, or spiritual discipline. Whatever fails in contributing to such an end, is at once the disgrace of letters and of genius.

We would not frown on works of imagination, since whatever tends to refine and purify the tastes, to engage men for a time in elegant pursuits, redeems life from grossness, and contributes to the completeness of human development.

But we must very clearly distinguish between taste and morals, between the amenities and refinements of lighter literature, and the graver principles of human faith and duty : we must not allow these to become the mere sport of fancy, to be capriciously whirled round the thaumatrope of a sportive or wild imagination. Men may play at other games, and find amusement and recreation in lighter matters.

Few authors have more gravely violated this plain rule of common sense, than Emerson, the American Essayist. Amidst many exquisite

passages, true touches of a poetical genius, we find such a wild perversity of confusion and contradiction, true lights and great principles turned into dancing meteors, and anon extinguished in the bog of mystical scepticism, that we are tempted to infer his want of instruction in "*Literary Ethics*," though he has lectured on the subject.

One of the tendencies of this age—an excessive influx of the oversoul—is in *the spirit of vagueness* and mysticism, which prevails amongst a certain class of literary men, as well as amongst the abettors of superstition and rationalism.

All these classes have a great horror of what is called the "*logical consciousness*;" they prefer dreams and *intuitions*, impulses and large leaps, like that of one of Homer's gods, whose intuitional horse leaped at one bound across the horizon. Accordingly, Mr. Emerson tells us,* "nothing is more simple than greatness; indeed, to be *simple* is to be great.† All vision, all genius, comes by renouncing the too officious activity of the understanding, and giving leave and amplest privilege to the spontaneous sentiment."

This kind of sentiment, is sometimes called sentimentality; and is the convenient cover for all sorts of logical inconsistencies.

The method adopted by this writer and the class he represents, is confessedly visionary; their dissertations are dreams, consisting of the usual incoherences, beautiful and contradictory visions, with gaps of profound darkness between. They talk in their sleep. They are literary somnambulists. It is as a dream when one awaketh. They sleep in the day, and see men as trees walking; and their description of the scene is fascinating, but not very instructive.

But a true man has a purpose, and is true to it: he will not unsettle truths and principles by a magic-lantern exhibition of them. He will give *lessons*; his followers will be scholars learning something: they will find an elevating tendency in lighter sallies; clearer and holier thoughts and manlier impulses in graver attempts. Their judgment will be illuminated, their souls moved, and not merely their fancy tickled by a spiritual pantomime.

It might be rude, but it would be honest and useful, to ask these vague teachers to translate into English—to condense into plain words, the points, connection, and bearing of their lucubrations.

"Exactly, my friend! it sounds very fine; but please to stand quite still, hold yourself steady by that lamp-post, and tell us just what it is you really mean."

"Literary Ethics," require that a teacher should have a purpose, he must please to instruct, and instruct to improve: he will not go about talking dreams, but aim to swell some good tendencies, to secure some practical end, to remove some gross darkness, to extend some great truths.

Without one or other of these, he is not a teacher but a "*rambler*;" or, as Johnson's Italian friend re-translated the title of his work, by calling him the great author of the "*vagabond*." Their utterances are not instructions but vagaries. Their main article of trade is the indefinite. They resent and scorn definitions; in other words, they never like to tell us what they are talking about.

* *Literary Ethics*.

† Does he mean a great simpleton? P. D.

An enquiry for explanation, is the "too officious activity of the understanding."

"To be great," Mr. Emerson tells us, is simply just "to be misunderstood:" no doubt, *omne ignotum pro mirifico*; it must be deep, because we cannot see to the bottom. Ghosts are best seen in the dark; and the sun would be very splendid if he did not shine so much.

But these men are open to no such rebuke; we cannot quite perceive their position, though laid down in this spiritual topography—"the man of genius should occupy the whole *space between God or pure mind, and the multitude of uneducated men.*"*

This would be a large space to fill, if the Creator were "far from every one of us," but an Apostle tells us that He is not far off, so the space is easily filled up; for nature abhors a vacuum.

But we are too vulgar in our conceptions, for by space between us and God, is to be mystically understood the disparity in wisdom of goodness. *This* is to be removed by genius;—a more difficult task perhaps. But in filling up this chasm, the genius has nothing to do, it all comes to him, he does not "go to the mountain." "The student, as we all along insist, is great only by being *passive to the superincumbent spirit.*"*

Such is the spiritual night-mare in these men's dreams: only they call it a "superincumbent spirit."

Truly enough then does our essayist confess, that when persons approach these oracles for further and more definite revelations, "they find that he is a poor ignorant man, like themselves, no-wise emitting a continuous stream of light, but now and then a jet of luminous thought, *followed by total darkness.*"

"Hence the temptation of the scholar to *mystify*; to hear the question: to sit upon it; to make an *answer of words*, in lack of the oracle of things."†

Confession is good, but the confession of the priesthood is most healthful for the souls of the laity.

We must not trouble these teachers with minute enquiries, but listen with wonder and such delight as we can muster, as they speak in words like glowing clouds of beauty and truth.

"What is this truth you seek? what is this beauty? men will ask with derision. If, nevertheless, God have called any of you to explore truth and beauty, be bold, be firm, be true."‡

Excellent advice, its greatness being seen in the fact, that none can understand it. "Be bold, and firm," in what?—In your expedition into cloud-land.

A new source of knowledge has of late been opened to the world, sometimes it is called the spontaneous sentiment, sometimes natural and permanent inspiration; or opening the mind that inspiration may flow in through the deeps of reason, &c.: but blessed is he that expecteth nothing from such illuminations, for he shall never be disappointed.

The *understanding* is depreciated, as belonging to the logical consciousness, whilst a superior process that takes shorter methods is introduced, called the *reason*; which with infidels, rational Christians and others, is the same as *faith* with the priests.

* Literary Ethics. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid.

Reason (in this new philosophical sense) like faith, is introduced to cover doctrines for which men have no reasons to adduce. It is a direct intuition into things, without the tedious intermediate process of argument. It avoids that troublesome method of employing what the logicians call a *middle term*. In jubilant language, it is the influx of God, or of the over-soul.

"We must pay our vows to the highest power, and pass if it be possible, by assiduous love and watching, into the *visions of absolute truth*. The growth of the intellect, is a *larger reception of a common soul*. An able man is nothing else than a good free vascular organization, *whereinto the universal spirit freely flows*."*

Each man is thus a part of the great soul, and gets wise by being open to further influxes: a most consoling doctrine, if anything would come of it, in the way of manifest wisdom.

The difference between man and God, is simply "*our INCARNATION in a private self*;" the defects and limitations of which, by "preferring the private law," are removed by communion with the "superincumbent spirit."

Thus is infidelity revenged in the crude and large credulity of its children, who becoming free from the claims of the gospel, seek to supply its place by this mawkish and profane sentimentalism.

This prepares the way for an explanation of the Redeemer's words, on the principles of *reason*. He preached not himself, but the soul; every man's soul as truly divine! And this jargon is to be the gospel of these days:—"the dawn of the *sentiment* of virtue," "this sentiment is divine and *deifying*. It makes man illimitable. It corrects the capital mistake of the infant man,—who seeks to be great by following the great, and hopes to derive advantage from *another*,—by shewing the fountain of all good to be in himself, and that he, equally with *every man*, is a *door into the deeps of reason*."† It would be a very good thing if some of them would open the door.

This however, it appears, would be of little service to others, since we can learn only for ourselves, not for others, out of these unfathomable deeps.

"Meantime, whilst the doors of the temple stand open night and day, [whether this door is *the man that is open*, Emerson does not say] before every man, [who also is the door] and the oracles of *this* truth cease never, it is *guarded by one stern condition*; this, namely, it is AN INTUITION. It cannot be received at second-hand."

To this high level of humanity, each one a door to his own particular and private peepshow, our author lifts the Redeemer himself. "Jesus Christ" he *informs* us, "belonged to the true race of prophets. He *saw with open eye* the mystery of the soul. Drawn by its severe harmony, ravished with its beauty, he lived in it, and had his being *there*. Alone in all history he estimates *the greatness of man*. He *saw that God incarnates himself in man*, and evermore goes forth anew to take possession of his world. He said in this jubilee of sublime emotion, 'I am divine. Through me God acts; through me, speaks. Would you see God, see me; OR SEE THEE, when thou thinkest as I now think.'"

* Literary Ethics.

† Orations.—An Address to the Senior Class in *Divinity* College, Cambridge, U. S.

What are we to say of such profane ranting as this? Is it not an obvious falsification of our Saviour's words? When did he discover the *greatness of man*, or say, "would you see God?—look at thyself?" *Never.*

This is a private inspiration, a peep through Mr. Emerson's door: full well may he complain of "*historical Christianity*;" for this stands sadly in the way of his "sublime emotions."

It was no rhapsody on *man* that our Redeemer uttered; he found man degraded enough; and was himself the fulness,—the deeps of wisdom, whence our life was to be drawn.

This sentimental reason that would exalt man in order to abase man's Redeemer, consistently laments that Christians pay so much regard to the *person* of Christ, instead of to the soul which is its own redeemer, and whose dignity Christ took figuratively to himself!

All say they are equally divine; unfortunately they do not all equally shew it; the assertion rests on the authority of newly baptized *reason*;—a faculty appealed to when argument fails.

Did the Redeemer ever say that man's soul has all resources in itself? His whole mission is a contradiction of it;—he came to *help* man, not to say that "the fountain of all good is in the soul itself, and cannot be obtained from another."

On the contrary, he said I am come that ye might have life; I am the life; without me ye can do nothing. I am the vine, ye are the branches; except ye abide in me, ye cannot bring forth fruit.

Is there any possible excuse then, for pressing the Saviour into the service of Mr. Emerson's reason, and of his doctrine of the Godhead of the soul,—the equal incarnation of the Divine Being in every man?

This astonishing ignorance, or profound disregard to the plain statements of Christianity, should cover such teachers with everlasting shame and confusion. It violates common honesty; it shocks common decency.

It is a fearful dishonesty or incompetence in such literary men, thus to distort the plain unvarnished teachings of the gospel: making the Redeemer a representative of the power that dwells in all men, instead of what he himself declares—the fountain of spiritual life to those who are lying in weakness and sin.

We are to appropriate to ourselves (according to Mr. Emerson) not the help Christ gives, but the original power and inherent greatness which he declared belonged to himself.

And by what wondrous magic are we thus to make him say, "*see God in me, or see him in thee?*" It is by laying aside the "too officious activity of the understanding," and adopting the new mode of *reason*—which is the infidel's *faith*.

"What a distortion (observes Emerson) did Christ's doctrine and memory suffer in the same, in the next, and the following ages! There is no doctrine of the reason which will bear to be taught by the understanding."* So we must veil our faces before the dogmas of this new priesthood, and accept the words of Jesus in the light of a Pantheist's reason.

"The understanding, (he tells us,) caught this high chaunt [of the Saviour's divinity] from the *poet's* lips, and said in the next age—'this

An Address, &c.

was Jehovah come down out of heaven.' Christianity thus became a Mythus.'"^{*}

No! It is you that make it a thin poetical myth, by decrying its historical character, and making the words of Christ not a peculiar doctrine respecting himself, but a revelation "of the hour and the man that *now is*; the eternal revelation of the heart."[†]

This is "eternal nonsense;" and can be defended only by inane assertions, a denial of logic and common sense, and an appeal from these to the new mythological hero called *reason*—*lucus a non lucendo*,—reason, because you have no reason for it.

Thus has our author "become *very sensible* of the first defect in historical Christianity: it is not the doctrine of the soul, [that is of the soul's divinity,] but an *exaggeration of the personal*;" it honours Christ too much; "it has dwelt with *noxious exaggeration* about the *person of Jesus*. The soul knows no persons. It invites *every man to expand to the full circle of the universe*."

This would certainly be a most prodigious swelling; so that the universe could hold only one such man or monster. It seems indeed as if in a strange fit of jealousy at the expansion of the authority of the Redeemer, (which does not leave room enough for Mr. Emerson's personal exaggeration,) some revenge were taken on the Saviour, by exalting every man into an imaginary deity.

This "doctrine of the soul" is to be our defence against the Redeemer of the soul: and his own words respecting himself, are (by the revolt of the reason against the understanding) made to mean his glorification of every man's soul.

"Alone, in all history, he [Jesus] estimated the greatness of man," "having seen that the law in us is commanding, *he would not suffer it to be commanded*."[‡] Boldly he declared it was God. Thus is he, I think, the only soul in history, that *appreciated the worth of man*."[§] Undoubtedly, he who "brought life and immortality to light," did in this, reveal the worth and importance of human nature; the *value of the soul*, but not its deity; not its independence of all help; for the fact of Jesus being the *only one* who exhibits this acknowledged perfection, is a *proof, that all others are different and inferior*.

But this doctrine does not suit Mr. Emerson, and hence he will be revenged on the greatness of Christ, by decrying all personal regard and attachment. "The manner in which his name is surrounded with expressions which were once *sallies* of admiration and love, but are now *petrified into official titles*, kills all generous sympathy and liking."^{||}

Our amiable philosopher is indignant at such preferences: so, after declaring in one "Oration," that Christ alone would not suffer men to be *commanded*; that he alone declared the *worth of a man*; this orator corrects his own concessions and our admiration, by the following exquisite antidote.

"Each man is a *tyrant* in tendency, because he would *impose* his idea on others. Jesus [who in one oration, "would not suffer man to be commanded,"] would absorb the race; but Tom Paine, or the coarsest blasphemous, *helps humanity by resisting this exuberance of power*."^{**}

* An Address, &c.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid.

§ Ibid.

|| Ibid.

** Essays. Nominalist and Realist.

Yes! the coarsest blasphemy sets matters right in the jealous ravings of our mystics, by correcting the tyranny and imposition of the only one who (as they assure us) has declared man's dignity.

It would be well if these dreamers would occasionally pinch themselves to find out that *they are not awake*; but only uttering wild incoherencies.

Thus does our orator find a sweet satisfaction in depreciation, and revenge himself on those who say, "subordinate your nature to Christ's nature." He is not an egotist, but likes to have something of *himself* in these revelations.

"That is always best, which *gives me to myself*. The sublime is excited in me, by the great stoical doctrine—obey thyself. That which *shews God in me, fortifies me*. That which shews God out of me, *makes me a wart and a wen*."

This, noble Sir, is a valid reason for you to receive such an outward vision; nor will any internal revelations enlarge the frog into the ox; or "expand" a vain little soul "to the full circle of the universe."

If the coarse blasphemer, is such a friend to humanity in resisting the exuberance of His power, who confessedly is the only revealer of the worth of humanity; perhaps a little honest criticism would not be useless, in correcting the exuberance of fame and influence acquired by our mystical and self-contradictory essayist.

What does he aim at? What does he mean? What can he accomplish? What new truth has welled up through *this "door"* out of the "*depths of reason*?" Words only, and not the "oracle of things:" clouds without water; that darken our daylight, and never fall in refreshing showers to fertilize the earth.

Christianity is a failure; it is historical and it is a myth;—contradictions to the understanding, but plain to the reconciling reason. The world has to trim its lamps once more; but what oil does Mr. Emerson supply?

He preaches *the soul*—this is the remedy; the patient is now the great physician. In the language of Christ, as interpreted by the understanding, He is the door for all men; but this language interpreted by the reason, means that "every man is a door" for himself.

"A true Christ, is now as always, *to be made* by the reception of beautiful sentiments;"* exactly, the prescription is good, but where is the dispensing chemist, that shall supply the ingredients?

Men "have not drunk so deeply into the sense of Christ, as to see that *only by coming again to themselves*, or to God in themselves, can they grow evermore."

"Only by coming" to this, but—how to get at it?

"And now my brothers will you ask—what in these desponding days can be done by us?"† Yes, brother! that is our question, and we will weigh your answer.

"The remedy is already declared; we have contrasted the Church with the soul. In the soul then, let the redemption be sought." But brother, we want a *redemption for the soul*! And you find it *there*? Yes. "In one soul, in your soul there are resources for the world."‡ This is consoling, *if it be not a delusion*. "True Christianity,—a faith

* An Address, &c.

† *Ibid.*

‡ *Ibid.*

like Christ's in the infinitude of man is lost. None believeth in the soul of man, but only in some man or person old and departed. Ah me! no man goeth alone. All men go in flocks to this saint or to that poet, avoiding the God that seeth in secret."

But how will you explain this riddle—that Christ had no faith in the infinitude of man; that Christ is not old and departed, but ever young and ever present; that this same Christ is, as he declared, "the way to the Father," and that therefore we do not avoid God by coming to him in Christ Jesus?

"Men," you tell us, "have come to regard revelation as somewhat long ago given and done, as if God were dead." How if this revelation tells of the everlasting God—"the *King immortal* and invisible?" Have you not dreamed out your knowledge of revelation? or where have you found it opposing, in the true sense, those "revelations which introduce greatness—yea, God himself into the open soul?"†

If a revelation of a present all-pervading and soul-invigorating spirit be what you desire, and you are unwilling to be cheated with the sounds of mystic words for the realities of a divine religion; then begin to read *historical Christianity*; the New Testament.

Will you find there that Christ is departed, or that God is excluded from the soul? "Jesus answered, and said unto him, if a man love me he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him."—(John xiv. 23.) "And of his fulness have we all received, even grace for grace."—(John i. 16.) "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and *ye are filled by him*."—(Col. ii. 9, 10.)

Assuming that Christianity denies or omits what you have stolen from it and spoiled, you send us on a strange errand to find our redemption in the spontaneous sentiment.

"O my friend, there are resources in us, on which we have not drawn;" then draw out *now*, that we may be gladdened by this new wine: do not stand tantalizing our thirst with these mocking promises, but reveal to us some utterance of the God within, if indeed "there exist in one soul resources for the world."

"None assayeth the stern ambition to be the self of the nation, and of nature, but each would be an easy secondary to some Christian scheme:" then why not yourself become a primary in a new scheme, that shall "give me to myself?"

Otherwise what help have we from this flowing rhetoric; would you mock us with the shew of golden apples to awaken our imagination and appetite, and then feed us with the ashes of disappointment?

Alas! brother, you acknowledge that *no help is possible*.

Yet the scholar is advised to give this impossible help to his despairing friends—"be to them a divine man; be to them thought and virtue."* O rare and excellent advice,—were we told how to practise it!

Unhappily we learn from the same oracle, that the practice is impossible; for "once leave *your own* knowledge of God, your own sentiment, and take in secondary knowledge, as St. Paul's, or George Fox's, or Swedenborg's, and you get wide from God with every year this secondary form lasts."

* An Address, &c.

† *Ibid.*

Then if St. Paul and George Fox only lead me astray, why should I "be a divine man" to others, and lead them astray also?

If they are told not to follow, why should I be told to lead?

"Let me admonish you first of all *to go alone*; to refuse the good models.—In the imitator something else (besides what he imitates) is natural; and he bereaves himself of his own beauty, to come short of another man's. Yourself, a new-born bard of the Holy Ghost, cast behind you all conformity, and acquaint men at first-hand with the Deity.—Be to them a man."[†]

But how can I acquaint men at first-hand, when, if they learn from me, it is at second-hand? And how can they learn from me, if the "stern condition is intuition,"—seeing for themselves? Or, how can they learn from me, if "by secondary knowledge they get wide of God?"

Such are the interrogatories a reader might put to this author, if the said reader were troubled with the "too officious activity of the understanding." But there is a plain answer founded upon the reason, namely, that as one person cannot see the intuitions of another, none must expect to see clearly those of Mr. Emerson. And as the reason proceeds without intermediate links, (usual to the logic of the understanding,) we cannot expect to trace the connexions which reconcile one statement of our author with another.

This explanation will solve our author's riddle—"what hinders that now, everywhere, in pulpits, in lecture rooms, in houses, in fields, you speak the very truth, as your life and conscience teach it, and cheer the waiting fainting hearts of men, with new hope and new revelation?" Nothing hinders, but the simple impossibility; since for men to learn from our revelation, is to learn at second-hand, which we have seen to be only a delusion.

But Christianity can afford the bewildered a better way; the very opposite, since it has no pretence to "his capital secret of converting life into truth, experience into doctrine," but aims at converting the incorruptible seed of the word, real solid *truth into the life: doctrine into vital experience.*

To convert our life into truth, is only to give the theory or science of ourselves;—to tell what we are; but we require some great principles on which to live, that shall bring forth fruit after their kind: giving not the science of what we are, but the science and impulse of what we should be.

This our author has not afforded; his utterances are fragments and contradictions, puzzles and conundrums.

All this contradiction is anticipated and defended in his philosophy of life, which is to be converted into truthful contradictions.

"The end and the means, the gamester and the game,—life is made up of the intermixture and reaction of these two amicable powers; whose marriage appears beforehand monstrous, *as each denies and tends to abolish the other.* We must reconcile the contradictions as we can, but their discord and their concord, *introduce WILD ABSURDITIES into our thinking and speech.* No sentence will hold the whole truth, *and the only way in which we can be just, is BY GIVING OURSELVES THE LIE.*

• An Address, &c.

† *Ibid.*

Speech is better than silence; silence is better than speech;—all things are in contact; every atom has a sphere of repulsion;—things are not at the same time;—*and the like*. All the universe over, there is but one thing, this old two-face, creator-creature, mind-matter, right-wrong, of which any proposition may be affirmed or denied.”*

This is a very encouraging and defensive idea; and will save our author, for whose especial advantage it must have been invented.

Mr. Emerson courteously reminds us in one oration † that “the old oracle said *all things have two handles: beware of the wrong one*.”

It would have been more useful though less oracular to have told us which was the wrong handle; or to have given some canon on the subject. But our new oracle says everything has two handles, *and neither of them is wrong*. For everything is “right-wrong,” “things are and are not at the same time.”

Perhaps he means by “right-wrong,” right down wrong, that is, quite wrong altogether. For men who speak after this fashion, cannot be *quite right*.

“Beware of the wrong handle” quoth the ancient oracle; “neither is wrong” quoth the modern oracle; and we add that both are wrong, for “the only way we can be just, is by giving ourselves the lie;” and accordingly, Mr. Emerson is a just man, perfect and upright, in this practice of self contradiction.

He must have had himself in his eye, or in ideal language must have contemplated the “god within,” when he penned the following:—

“A mistake of the main end to which they labour, is incident to literary men, who dealing with the organ of language—the subtlest, strongest, and longest lived of man’s creations, and only fitly used as the weapon of thought and justice,—learn to enjoy the pride of *playing* with this splendid engine, but rob it of its almightiness (!) by failing to *work* with it.

Extricating themselves from all the *tasks* of the world, the world revenges itself *by exposing, at every turn, the folly of these incomplete, pedantic, useless, ghostly creatures*.”‡

After the illuminations of “the spontaneous sentiment,” the glances through this “door into the deeps of reason,” in which we hope hereafter to shew that there are “lower deeps,” we may conclude, in the words of our author—

—“You will pardon me gentlemen, if I say, *I think we have need of a more rigorous scholastic rule*; such an asceticism, I mean, as only the hardihood of the scholar himself can enforce. *We live* in the sun and *on the surface*,—a thin plausible, superficial existence, and *talk* of muse and prophet, of art and creation. *But out of our shallow and frivolous way of life, how can greatness ever grow?* Come now let us go and be dumb.* [Like the *old* oracles.] Let us sit with our hands on our mouths, a long austere, Pythagorean lustrum.”§

This is the right handle at last.

* Essays. Nominalist and Realist. † Man thinking. ‡ Literary Ethics. § *Ibid*.

V.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN NATURE.

The Nature of Man as Spiritual, Immortal, and Responsible, will be the most frequent topic of this department: though sometimes we shall introduce MISCELLANEOUS Subjects.

THE NATURE OF FAITH.

A Note in explanation, by the writer of Article I.—Christianity a Reasonable Religion.

To discuss the whole question of the Philosophy of Faith, would require too much space for any single number of *the Bible and the People*; not because the question is difficult in itself, for it is very simple; but because of the many other ideas associated with faith, some true, and some false, but most of them supposed to be parts of a peculiarly complex process, called faith.

We do not profess here to enter polemically into the subject, but simply to give a few hints and explanations, especially in reference to the Rev. J. Evans' suggestions.*

The article criticised with candour and moderation by that writer, entered into the subject of faith only *incidentally*, as connected with the *reasonableness* of Christianity, which your correspondent fully admits, as well as the main point aimed at, viz., to prove that faith and reason are not opposed to each other.

We did not assert, nor intend to imply, that in *every* case where faith is used, it is identical with reason or understanding; though in some cases it is: and invariably as employed in the Scriptures, it is fundamentally a process of the understanding; in other words, is based on evidence or reasons.

It should be remembered that this is to some extent a philosophical question, into which the Scriptures do not formally enter; and that in the article referred to, we professedly *confined ourselves to the intellectual aspect* of Christianity; though we also directly recognized "the concurrence of the will with the undertaking," in the elements or results of *faith in Christ*: thus we called faith "the exercise of wisdom," this is of course in its *practical* relations.

It is not merely a conception, or a clear idea of a theory, but the *recognition of a reality*; used technically as connected with salvation, "to believe in Jesus Christ, is to *understand* what he is, and what he came for, and to *accept him in that capacity*."

But all this is more than *faith* considered abstractedly; it includes the *object of faith*,—the Redeemer; and the results of *that* faith,—salvation.

* See No. IV.

We must not imagine that "faith," always means "*the faith that saves*;" since strictly speaking, *no faith saves*, it is Christ that saves: *salvation is no part of faith*, but a result,—if we believe in the Saviour.

To use logical terms, salvation or justification is an *accident*, depending on the object of our conviction or trust. Building is not a different process, when on the sand and on the rock, but takes a different foundation; so faith, belief, reliance, trust or conviction, is ever the same; it results in ruin or safety according as it is unwisely or wisely directed.

Setting aside therefore the object and results of faith, we may examine *the process in itself*, or the common element in the different uses of the term in the Scriptures: and the result will perhaps be,—that the foundation of faith lies in evidence laid before the understanding, such as to end in conviction: it will, according to the object or truth believed, *result* also in moral emotions and active conduct; and these again in condemnation or salvation.

Hence we find the term employed, sometimes purely for the intellectual operation; as in our Lord's language, quoted in the article referred to: sometimes more extensively for the moral results within us, and in our life; "faith which worketh by love;"—a "*life of faith*;" that is, of active obedience to spiritual truths: sometimes technically as meaning reliance on the redemption by Christ Jesus, with all the consequences—in our souls, in our life, in our destiny; this is the Apostle Paul's occasional use of the term.

It would take up too much space here, to shew by what method this Apostle makes the term faith stand for so much;—the gospel itself; its reception; its plan; its results, &c., all these are the different uses of the term by this inspired writer.

And therefore, in discussing such a subject, we should consider *in which of the many applications* we are employing the word.

In our enquiry into the reasonableness of Christianity, it was sufficiently obvious, that we considered faith in its intellectual bearing; and therefore abstracted from the frequent additional matters technically associated with it. We referred to its primary and essential element, common to each case,—*a state of the understanding*,—in opposition to infidels and priests, who make faith blind.

It may be instructive to refer to some different uses of this term in the Scriptures. Now faith is the *ground for hoping for things*; the *conviction* in the understanding of things not seen by the bodily sense.—(Heb. xi. 1.) This is a distinction between the reason and the senses; and gives the essence of faith, to the exclusion of its peculiar results in Christianity.

"Through the *faith*, we understand that the worlds are framed by the word of God;" it is a matter of evidence, or testimony, addressed to the understanding; and is a recognition of something beyond sense: "so that the things which are seen, were *not made of things that do appear*."—(Heb. xi. 3.)

This leads to another element of faith, namely, it is not only a process of the understanding, but relates to spiritual things; it goes beyond appearances; *looking "not at the things which are seen,"* for we "walk by faith, not by sight;" by our mental convictions, not by our sensible

experience; by the polestar of a providence that works against present seeming ill. Thus, in following the enlightened conscience, instead of sense, we are allied to what is eternal; a house in the heavens. Here we learn both the nature of the process, and the objects of it: it is the understanding turned to spiritual and eternal realities. But when made more definite in its aim, as directed to the Redeemer, it results in more than this general spiritual process, namely, deep personal affections, the Christian life. This difference results from the different object, not from a different faith.

"The devils believe and tremble;" (James ii. 19.) but this is not saving faith; because they have no Saviour to believe in: they believe in justice, and tremble: we believe in mercy, and rejoice. The intellectual process is the same: the moral results are different. Perhaps also it may appear, that the difference between the converted and the unconverted, both of whom are said to believe in the Bible, consists in the fact (however morally explained) that one has a momentary or occasional recognition of these truths; the other a fixed idea, a permanent, moral, spiritual habit; for which also the term faith is sometimes employed:—"the *life* of faith," the "full assurance of faith unto the end." The one allows the thoughts of other things to enter in and choke the word, so that it becomes *unfruitful*.

Hence faith as an element of character, is a permanent conviction, not an *occasional opinion*, believing while we hear a sermon; and putting our so-called beliefs on the shelf of memory, while our week's *work shows our faith* in "what we shall eat, what we shall drink, and wherewithal we shall be clothed."

But the foundation for the opposite moral habit, must be laid in our thoughts, our reason, or understanding, as we weigh the importance of the soul, and the claims of the Redeemer. For this purpose God has given us the basis or ground for hoping for things; the conviction, or evidence to produce the conviction of things not seen by our bodily eyes.

And so closely is this faith allied to our reasonable understanding, THAT "FAITH" IS USED FOR EVIDENCE, OR REASONS FOR BELIEF, in the New Testament itself. "Whereof he hath given *assurance* unto all men, in that he hath raised Christ from the dead."—(Acts xvii. 31.)

In the original, the term translated "*assurance*," is *faith*; and it plainly means, grounds for faith, reasons for assurance; and so plain is the evidence, so reasonable the appeal to our convictions, that *the reasons themselves are called "faith,"* as being fully sufficient to satisfy our understandings.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

KEEP THE LIGHT AWAY.

The following suspicious case deserves the especial attention of our readers. The Government having sent a Commission to enquire into the Universities, (like a policeman with a lantern examining holes and corners for lurking thieves,) the University authorities protest against the policeman, as a Pagan aggression.

And very naturally, for they that do not the truth, do not come to the light, as is plain from the annexed paragraph.

"Oxford University Commission.—A paper has just been circulated containing the "Case on the part of the University of Oxford," and the "opinion of counsel thereon." The following is the opening paragraph of this opinion :—"We are of opinion that the Commission is not constitutional, or legal, or such as the University or its members are bound to obey ; and that the Commission cannot be supported by any authority of the Crown, either as visitor, or under any prerogative or other right. As to visitatorial authority it may be granted that formerly the Pope and other ecclesiastics interfered in the affairs of the University ; but the universities were then considered ecclesiastical bodies, and subject to the jurisdiction of the ordinary : and it may also be granted that the power which had been exercised by the Pope as supreme ordinary, was, after the Reformation, claimed by the Crown, and that acts were done by it under that claim : but it is clear now that the universities are lay, civil corporations ; and this character they would have received by the Act of 13th Eliz., c. 29, if they had not possessed it before : and 'being lay corporations, the ordinary neither can nor ought to visit,' [see the case of Sutton's Hospital] and consequently the Crown cannot visit under any supposed ecclesiastical claim." After citing a number of authorities for this view of the question, the learned gentlemen conclude as follows :—"If the University, having regard to the rights, liberties and privileges of its present and future members, shall, upon consideration, think that it ought not to submit to the authority of the Commissioners until the legal validity of their Commission shall have been established by competent authority, we are of opinion that the best and most respectful course will be for the University to bring under the consideration of the Crown the nature of this Commission, in order to the discussion of its legality, and to its being recalled and cancelled if illegal ; and that for such purpose, the University should petition her Majesty in Council, stating in effect the loyal wish expressed in the case, 'to show every possible deference and respect for the Crown,' the nature of the advice which the University has received respecting the Commission, the dangers which may be apprehended from the precedent if the Commission is allowed to continue, and to pray accordingly that the Commission may be recalled and cancelled ; or otherwise, that it may be reconsidered by her Majesty in Council, and that, in the latter case, the University may be heard by counsel against it.—Signed.—G. J. TURNER, RICHARD BETHELL, HENRY S. KEATING, J. R. KENYON.—*Lincoln's Inn, March 3, 1851.*"

Here we find the University unchurching itself, putting off its ecclesiastical character to escape the Queen's supremacy.

We hope this opposition to enquiry will make Government or at least the people more earnest in pressing a strict examination.

REVIEWS AND CRITICISMS.

The Bible truly described and fairly vindicated, in a series of Letters. By the Rev. John R. BEARD, D. D. London: E. T. Whitfield, Essex Street, Strand; Manchester: A. Heywood.

The idea of this work is very good;—penny monthly Letters, on such difficulties relating to the Bible as may arise in intelligent enquiring minds. In reference to critical historical or moral questions, the learned and intelligent author is well able to afford much light and satisfaction; but we must regret that his adhesion to a form of Christianity in which the atonement is a figure, stands as an insuperable barrier to extensive usefulness. It is fatal to all spiritual power, either in advocating the Bible itself, or adapting it to accomplish much practical benefit.

Whilst we could not advocate reserve or dishonesty, it may perhaps be fairly considered by Dr. Beard and such as hold his sentiments,—whether in works aiming at the general public, especially considering the usual idea of liberality, in the indifference (as to salvation) of doctrinal points, it would not be wise and consistent to hold in abeyance certain negations?

What these writers hold in common with the Orthodox Trinitarian, might thus be employed in argument and commendation of the Scriptures, whilst they could, consistently with their own principles, leave any further deductions to the reason of the reader. This would not interfere with decidedly and acknowledged Unitarian productions; but would give a wider sphere to the talents of such as are otherwise confined to their own denomination, with the exception of the ministry or literary class amongst the orthodox.

The Core of Creeds; or, St. Peter's Keys. By the Rev. D. THOMAS, Stockwell. London: Ward and Co.

This is exactly the kind of book to afford a remedy for the serious defect in the class of literature referred to in the preceding notice.

Mr. Thomas finds the Key-truth, in the nature and work of Christ as “the Redeeming God.” This is indeed the secret of all spiritual power in connexion with Christianity: the Christian religion has Christ for the centre of it. The true idea of him, is the rock on which the Church is built. All this is forcibly and beautifully exhibited in the Core of Creeds. The introduction is the true Key-note,—“that the right idea of Christ, is the most important element in human creeds.” But we hope many of our readers will be refreshed by a perusal of the work for themselves. It is extremely opportune, as the true answer to Peter’s descendant and his claims to the Keys.

A Lecture on the Great Exhibition. By the Rev. J. ANDREWS. Jackson & Walford.

A short history of similar exhibitions, and an estimate of the probable commercial and moral results of the Exhibition in London.

A Manual of Faith and Practice, designed principally for the junior members of General Baptist Churches. Well adapted for its purpose. By W. CHAPMAN, Longford. London: B. L. Green.

Village Lectures on Popery. By the Rev. William ELLIS. London: Ward and Co.

A plain simple and satisfactory exposure of Romish Doctrines and Practices; admirably suited to the general reader; and from which indeed most readers may find instruction.

It is rendered more interesting and convincing by a reference not only to history, but the actual doings at Rome seen by the author himself.

We earnestly wish the work an extensive circulation.

I.

CHRIST'S RELIGION.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD." 1 Thess. v. 21.

GATHERING OF THE NATIONS.*

"God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation. Practically, however, the unity of our race has yet to be realized." The circulation of the vital current of humanity is still languid and irregular. There has ever indeed been a yearning for this perfect oneness—but the practicability of its attainment—Christianity alone reveals. The founder of the stoic philosophy proclaimed it as the highest of human aims, that "men should not be separated by cities, states, and laws, but that all should be considered fellow-citizens, and partakers of one life, and that the whole world, like a united flock, should be governed by one common law." That "common law" (the "new commandment" contained in the "common salvation" the Pagan sage never discovered. With truth, therefore, Plato said, in quoting his sentiment: "Zeno had some phantom of a dream before him when he wrote." Yet in that transient and beautiful vision we may see one of the unconscious prophecies of heathendom—a faint glimpse of the truth uttered by our Lord within the porch of the temple:—"other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." Intimations of this design are given with greater or less distinctness in every part of divine revelation. We propose in this paper to trace them.

I. The Bible points us to the ORIGIN AND PRIMARY DISTRIBUTION OF THE NATIONS.

Our race sprang from one progenitor. Because of the early and rapid prevalence of moral corruption—with the exception of a single family—it was swept away by the deluge. The various tribes now in existence are the descendants of Shem, Ham, and Japheth—the sons of Noah. "Of them," we are told, "was the whole world overspread." "These are the families of the sons of Noah—after their generations, in their nations, and by these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood." For a time these primitive tribes, from their consanguinity, and

* "I will gather all nations and tongues: and they shall come and see MY GLORY."
—Isaiah lvi. 18.

desire for mutual protection, clung around the paternal settlement. The necessity, at length arose for migration and the more extensive occupation of the unpeopled regions. "In the days of Peleg," says the inspired historian, "the earth was divided." Up to a certain period, the whole earth was of one language—and of one speech, and so, if in obedience to the divine command, the people had followed in the right direction, they might have remained. But, "as they journeyed from the East, they found a plain in the land of Shinar: and they dwelt there." Combining their energies in this place, they vainly determined to assert their independence of the Most High, and, if possible, to frustrate his plans. They said, "Let us build us a city, and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven: and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." For this act of impious folly they were rebuked by the silent but effective stroke of omnipotence. Their confederacy was broken in an instant. "The Lord did *there* confound the language of all the earth, and from *thence* did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth." This judicial dispersion of the human race preserved it from utter extermination. In a state of uncontrolled rebellion against God—evil would become so rampant that society could not exist. Without frontiers, without variations of climate and diversities of language, military ambition would have no check. The tribes of the earth would exterminate each other.

It was needful therefore for the Supreme Ruler to put the inhabitants of the earth, while under the influence of moral mania, into separate wards, and to restrain, to some extent, their intercommunication. This separation is not intended to be permanent. For

II. THE BIBLE CLEARLY EXHIBITS THE DESIGN OF GOD TO BRING ALL NATIONS INTO A STATE OF SACRED UNITY.

Mark the gradual unfolding of this purpose. The patriarch Jacob when dying said, "the sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come: and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." In reference to this divine intention, one nation was selected and placed in the central region of the earth, as then inhabited, to become the depository of the truth and its chosen witness. "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam—he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel,"—or, to adopt the paraphrase of Dr. J. P. Smith:—"the Almighty and Omniscient Jehovah has decreed and disposed all beings and events, in all time and every place, upon a perfect system of mutual relationship, every part of which corresponds to every other: therefore, by his provident wisdom and power, he directed the movements and settlements of all the tribes of men in such a manner as would, after the lapse of a thousand years, combine every agent and instrument for putting the Israelites into possession of the country promised to their ancestors, and thereby demonstrating them to be the peculiarly favoured of God." He established a testimony in Jacob. "I will place (said the Lord,) salvation in Zion for Israel my glory." From that central shrine the light of truth gleamed forth on the surrounding nations. Still, it served only, with very partial exceptions, to render the darkness visible. The nations walked in their own ways—

learning nothing by experience and bent on their own destruction. Nothing, in consequence, could arrest their perpetual tendency to dissolution. Not the time-defying science of laborious Egypt—not the imperial magnificence of Babylon—not the luxurious refinements of Persia—not the noble genius of intellectual Greece—nor the profound sagacity, proud glories, and stern resolution of Rome. All perished in succession from inherent moral corruption. Even the ancient people of Israel became divided: they departed from the truth, were driven into captivity, and sank into hopeless decay. Everything in the spirit and tendency of the nations was opposed to the divine plan. It was not on this account however, lost, forgotten, or abandoned. Amid the desolation of ruined empires, and the murmurings of an unbelieving and prostrate race, the voice of the Eternal may be distinctly heard: “I know their works and their thoughts: **IT SHALL COME**, that I will gather all nations and tongues: and **THEY SHALL COME** and see my glory.” “It shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills: and all nations shall flow unto it.” “I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come—and I will fill this house with glory.”

Passing onward, we come to that silent juncture of eras,—called in the emphatic language of Scripture—the **FULNESS OF TIME**. For a season the earth is still and at rest. The sounds of conflict are hushed that we may listen to the melody of the angel-song. “Glory to God in the highest—and on earth peace, good-will toward men.” In the light of this new dispensation, the true cause of discord and alienation is disclosed. **SIN** is revealed as the grand principle of enmity and division. The advent of the **SAVIOUR** is proclaimed. The nature, possibility, the terms and conditions of the only real permanent and universal peace are made known. The atonement of Christ is set forth as the divine *basis* of reconciliation—the word of truth as the *means*—the *Spirit of grace* as the omnipotent *agency* for the production of deep and perfect harmony. The principles of the covenant of peace being settled, and full sanction being given to its provisions in the resurrection of the surety—an example was given of its divine validity in the scenes of the Pentecost. For a single day at least, the world saw the realization of fraternal unity such as had never before been witnessed. “Parthians and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and Proselytes—Cretes and Arabians”—all were brought beneath the spell of a divine attraction. “The multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul.” What if these scenes had been daily renewed? What if the heaven then at work had permeated the entire mass of mankind? It was not so. The bright and lovely dawn of Christianity was overcast. From that hour the reign of the Prince of Peace has been maintained—but we see not as yet all things brought under its benignant sway. Why? The strength of man’s enmity was not fully developed until exhibited in his perversion of the gospel, and in his wilful rejection of the gospel.

Is then the divine determination given up? Not for a moment. Discordant elements have been quickened into greater activity—scenes of

violence have been enacted, more than ever frightful and revolting—and the prospect of universal amity rendered in appearance more distant. Nevertheless, the counsel of God, that shall stand.

"I know their works and their thoughts—it shall come." "I will gather all nations and tongues: and they shall come, and see my glory."

And are there no signs of this unconscious gathering? For what purpose is it that the most distant parts of the earth have been so carefully explored?—that the means of communication have become so rapid and so extensively multiplied?—that the dwellers at the Antipodes have been introduced to each other?—what mean the various international movements of the age—philanthropic, pacific, and industrial? The Cobdena, Matthews, Barretts, Mazzinis, and Gavazzis, have their mission. Defective, as we think, in the main spring of operation—yet subservient to the master design of providence, in relation to the tribes of men. They may serve only to disclose evils they have no power to remove—or give expression to wants beyond their power to redress—but even this result will be beneficial. "There are," says Vinet, "inflexible spirits whom age only hardens, and who die in their superstition, fanatical to the last, touching enlightenment, civilization, and freedom. But the greater number disabuse and free themselves before they die. Some of them have been seen smiling at their former worship, and trampling under their feet with disdain the ruins of their former idols. The soul is easily satiated with what is not true; and disgust is then proportioned to previous enthusiasm. Ye will come to this, ye who believe in the regeneration of the human race by political freedom; ye who have never known that until man becomes the servant of God he can never enjoy true freedom: ye will groan over your dreams, when popular passions have perhaps colored them with blood! Ye will come to this, ye who are confident in your native generosity, in the liberality of your sentiments and the purity of your intentions, in a word, ye that have faith in yourselves. When a thousand humiliating falls have convinced you of your weakness, when disabused with reference to others, ye shall be disabused also with reference to yourselves, when ye shall exclaim, like Brutus, "O virtue, thou art only a phantom!" what will then remain to you? That which has remained to so many others, the pleasures of selfishness or of sensuality, the last bourne of all errors, the vile residuum of all systems. If, indeed, it shall not then be given you to accept, in exchange for the faith which has deserted you, a better faith which will never desert you."

The grand impediment to universal fraternity is the enmity of the carnal mind. Alienated in heart from the Father of Spirits man is estranged from his brethren. Regard to commercial interest—social immunities, and secular freedom may restrain hostility and lengthen out the truce. But selfish neutrality is not the same with cordial unity. Passion is stronger than prudential caution—and unless the members of the general family are bound together in mutual sympathy and sacred affection, there is no guarantee for permanent peace.

"From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?"

God's plan is to extirpate these lusts. He has not miscalculated his

power to effect this object—neither has he erred in the selection of the means, nor yet has he lost time for its accomplishment. Every system for the amelioration of the human race that would supersede that of the gospel must be tried—and tried to fail. God's purposes will stand. His resources remain—and in the time selected in infinite wisdom, the barriers will be removed—light will be diffused—love pure, intense, and of heavenly origin, will be “shed abroad.” Every domestic, social, and national influence will be sanctified. Every variety of personal character—experience and endowment will be put under contribution. Christianity will become the fact, the life, the bond, the joy of the earth. There will be no more sea. Distance will be annihilated, and agitation will cease. In anticipation of that blessed consummation, the true Christian labours and waits. No effort of faith, no influence exerted, in unison with the purpose of heaven, can be lost. The labours of the past will be interlinked with those of the present, and both connected with the results of the future. Take an illustration :—two centuries ago, the second pastor of this church,* (John Lothrop,) was surprised by constables, and with forty-two of his little congregation thrown into prison, where they remained for two years. “During the time of his imprisonment,” says Nathaniel Morton, author of *New England's Memorial*, published in 1689, “his wife fell sick, of which sickness she died. He procured liberty of the bishop to visit his wife before her death, and commended her to God by prayer, who *soon after gave up the ghost*. At his return to prison, his poor children being many, repaired to the Bishop at Lambeth and made known unto him their miserable condition, by reason of their good father's being continued in close durance, who commiserated their condition so far as to grant him liberty, who soon after came over into New England.” This touching incident, until lately, was lost to history in this country. You will find no trace of it in our records—and the inhabitants of this locality were as profoundly unacquainted with it, as the residents of any village in the centre of China might be supposed to be. But circumstances have arisen which will revive the memory of that sacred, peaceful, yet momentous struggle. Within the last few days, letters of the deepest interest have been received from the descendants of John Lothrop, the Pilgrim. Some of them are now on their way to this country—that on the spot where their noble ancestor faithfully preached and meekly endured, they may interchange with the church of which he was pastor, sentiments of fraternal regard. “The *kindreds of the earth*” are becoming, then, better known to each other—and in Christian affinities they are made to feel the power of associations nothing but love to the truth could originate. That saying is indeed true, “one soweth, and another reapeth.” Both he that soweth and he that reapeth shall rejoice together. The end will crown all. That other saying is also true : “it shall come, that I will gather all nations and tongues : and they shall come, and see my glory.” Happy for us will it be, if we can mingle in the throng—enter into its gladness—and gaze upon the bright and never-fading vision. The pure in heart only shall see God. No heart can be made pure but by the application of atoning blood, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.

* The substance of this article was given in a discourse at Union Street Chapel, High Street, Southwark.

II.

PRIEST'S RELIGION.

HUMAN AUTHORITY AND INVENTION *versus* CONSCIENCE AND THE BIBLE.

The Scriptures are the only standard of Christian faith and practice : every one is at liberty to examine them ; but no one is at liberty to decline this examination : and though we may receive the help of others, we may not rest on their authority, (which is man-worship ;) nor receive as religion, what is not in the Scriptures, (which is will-worship.)

THE CONVERTS TO ROME :—WHERE EDUCATED?

AN APPEAL TO CHURCHMEN.

In the unceasing conflict between truth and error, commenced by our Redeemer, revived again and again into greater earnestness, it becomes every one, how small soever his influence, to employ it on the right side ; and to take his position in the immediate forms of contest carried on in his own age.

It is not enough that we adopt those truths whose validity has been settled by the arguments and sufferings of our forefathers ; we must seek to extend and enlarge the patrimony for our successors : we must visit Christ in prison, acknowledge his word when it is overlooked or despised, and not merely passively receive what is already acknowledged and honoured.

It cannot be a matter of indifference to a patriotic Christian what opinions and practices shall form a part of the national religion ; it is a shame, especially to such as have abandoned the nationally established worship, either to be ignorant of its character, or to be backward in adducing reasons for this departure from established forms and systems.

But when we further consider the momentous consequence of widespread religious error,—“ when it increases to more ungodliness,”—swells into still more palpable superstitions, the “ time for silence ” is gone, and the “ time to speak ” out has arrived. By seizing upon this time, we at least deliver our own souls, and do our part towards the deliverance of others.

With many it is fashionable to satisfy themselves with severe invectives against Puseyite Clergymen, who by their *Evangelical brethren* are said to be dishonestly “ eating our bread ; ” and hence, the cure for all evils, is in silencing these men. *Why then are they not silenced ?* Because they speak with authority, having their Prayer-book on their side.

Here are the unquestionable credentials : and therefore we must admit the legality ; but deny the truth of their doctrines. We must examine the constitution and fabric of the Church of England itself.

Whilst all Protestants are admitted to a license of invective against the Church of Rome ; it is presumed by many, (and even some among Dissenters,) that in our opposition to what we regard as the errors of the Church of England, we are to adopt a softened medium, called sometimes charity ; at other times, moderation.

Though truth is of so stubborn a nature, that it will not bend to any arch or angle, but is a straight line, and in reality, is the only charity. We may speak against *Romanists* ; but not against *Romanism* : its most palpable form, not its essential spirit.

It is frequently supposed, nay, constantly asserted, by men otherwise professing and advocating charity, that all direct opposition to the doctrines and constitution of the Church of England, is the "hostilities" of "bitter enemies;" thus do men *judge others by their own feelings*, and bring a moral accusation in answer to even Scriptural arguments.

In this way our Lord himself, and his Apostles, were bitter enemies of all whom they condemned.

It is wonderful how men regard earnestness in the advocacy of unwellcome truths, as stirring up the waters of strife, and how readily they forget that in these respects our Lord came not to send peace, but a sword on the earth ;—a sword that was never to be sheathed, the scabbard of truce with error, being utterly cast away.

The forgetfulness of the duty of contention for the truth ; and willingness to stigmatize as evil, all who contend earnestly against cherished errors, has been of late well rebuked by one who having tried the ministry of the Church of England for fifty years, gives his solemn testimony against it.

"Most painfully am I aware of the suspicions so frequently awakened in what pass for religious minds, under circumstances of remonstrance and reproof. This is no novelty. The most faithful, among the faithful, of the ministers of the seventeenth century wrote,—'I find it impossible to avoid the offending of guilty men. I except those that are willing to know the worst of themselves; and long to know their sins, that they may forsake them. A poor drunkard or swearer will more patiently hear of his sin, than many that we hope are godly, will of theirs. But godliness was never made to be the credit of men's sins; nor is sin to be let alone, or well thought of, when it can but get into a godly man. Shall we hate them most, whom we are bound to love most? and shall we shew it by forbearing our plain rebuke, and suffering their sin upon them?' It is the sinful unhappiness of some men's minds, that they disaffect them that cross them in their proceedings, and plainly tell them of their faults. And they are ready to judge of the reprover's spirit by their own, and to think that such sharp reproofs proceed from some disaffection to their persons, or partial opposition to the opinions which they hold. . . . But plain dealers are always approved in the end; and the time is at hand, when you shall confess that those were your truest friends. I crave your candid interpretation of my boldness; assuring you, that I obey not the counsel of my flesh herein, but displease myself

as much as some of you : and had rather have the ease and peace of silence, if it would stand with duty and the Churches' good.'"^{*}

As to the practical basis for a *union of candour*, (not of a misdirected charity,) the same writer drew up the following amongst other resolutions, which deserve a careful study.

"That we will *not defend nor palliate, in any communion with which we are severally connected, neither in any other, under the veil of false candour, known errors, whether of doctrine, discipline, or conventional practice ; but rather consider the intrusion and vindication of such evils to be matter, in the first instance, of humiliation and disgrace, and then of scrutiny, with a view to their exposure and rejection.*

"That we are convinced of the guilt and peril of ostensibly supporting what, in the interior of our souls, we confess to be indefensible ; that we *disclaim the pleas of imperfection, prescription, antiquity, ancestral recollection, domestic obligation, and similar modes of defence*, although by all parties so frequently advanced as apologies for evident and curable evil ; and that *we regard all such extenuations, as merely indicating the universal unwillingness of mankind to censure and reform their own cherished institutions.* We detect the subtle agencies of the same phenomena sarkos—' which some do expound the wisdom ; some, the sensuality ; some, the affection ; some the desire of the flesh '—in the disposition of our wayward and selfish nature to deny its inherent depravity, when *this corruption manifests itself in intolerance, in suspicious jealousy of beneficial changes*, in hard determinations to resist conviction, and *in refusing to confess the blemishes and degeneracy of any specific system*, if connected with individual interest and credit—all which causes of evil have more or less characterized every Christian society down to the present age of the world, and began to be developed in the early days of the primitive Church itself."[†]

It is under the defence of such statements and principles that we advance to the consideration of the origin of the recent additions to the ranks of the Papists ;—in other words, **THE CONVERTS TO ROME,—WHERE ARE THEY EDUCATED?**

By what influences Popery is fostered, that so our efforts may be wisely directed against the real source of the evil.

That there are Evangelical ministers in the Church of England, is not to be doubted ; the only question is, *ought they to be there*, since the Church is not Evangelical : and their presence forms a cloak and apology for upholding a system which agrees with what is considered to be unevangelical?

So much does this hurtful apology and pretext prevail, that many persons take a single Evangelical clergyman as a type of the Church, forgetting the many active Puseyites by whom he may be surrounded ; and so are silent against an evil system, because a few good men lend it their countenance.

Such misplaced goodness, will have much to answer for !

We however in this enquiry, have nothing to do with individuals, but only with a system.

It should be remembered that *we are often the least acquainted with*

* Baxter's Preface to Gildas Salvianus.

† The Rev. John Hilland, M.A.

that with which we are the most familiar; the habit of looking at things, often prevents our seeing them: hence what is customary and usual to us is never thought of; whilst were it introduced to us for the first time, or were another for the first time to examine it, the subject might appear in a very different light.

Hence many lay members of the Church of England, (who have seriously considered only their Bibles, and such elements of true religion as are presented in connexion with their services;) have never critically examined the peculiar and distinctive doctrines and rites of the Church; *they believe and receive just what the majority of Dissenters do*, and by the force of passive habit overlook the rest.

Hence they cannot understand, and can scarcely forgive the remonstrances of those who have examined the whole question by a different standard; and whilst they heartily condemn the Puseyite, they are equally warm against the Dissenter, who only joins them in condemning Puseyism.

In truth, what we want in order to union of feeling and agreement of principle, is simply to understand each other.

To overleap that mound of prejudice which interested men lay between the laity of the Church and the advocates of dissent; and see that what the one condemns in practice, the other condemns in theory.

To clear up this point as far as lies in our power, and prepare for a candid investigation into those delusions to which men are exposed, in order to a more complete reformation, we shall make good the three following propositions.

1. That in the established formularies of the Church of England, there is sufficient ground for Puseyism.

2. That Puseyism consistently leads to Romanism.

3. That, therefore, the Church needs a Bible reformation, the first part of which will be, the emancipation of the Church from legal bondage, so that the two opposite clerical parties may separate from each other, taking their respective portions of the Prayer-book; while the laity make a new one for themselves.

1. Our first proposition then is, that in the established formularies of the Church of England, there is sufficient ground for Puseyism.

It is not to be denied but the contradictory elements at work in the Reformation of the English Church, have each left traces in her constitution, and therefore *there are parts* which an Evangelical may subscribe to, and to which he may give the chief prominence.

But *the other parts*, more extensive and emphatic, would, if received, perfectly nullify these; just as Christ was of no effect to those who became circumcised.

Indeed, in the Church of Rome itself, there is room for Evangelicalism, if any of her priests passing by her ritual, should confine their ministrations chiefly to the parts which recognize the redemption by Jesus Christ.

Every truth which we hold, is recognized in some form by the Roman Church; the only fault we can find with her is, that she overlays the truth, with rites, and forms, and superstitious sacraments, which make the truth of none effect.

And therefore, in examining any system, we must not consider merely

what truth is in it; *but what error*; not whether there be “good wheaten bread,” but whether poison be introduced.

Now every clergyman at his ordination, declares “that there is nothing in the Prayer Book contrary to the word of God.”

This is part of the solemn declaration, without which, no one can minister in the Church of England. Thus do they all endorse everything in that book; and it therefore is what we have to test, as containing the principles and practices of the Puseyites.

The first distinguishing practice of the Puseyites, is “*daily morning and evening prayers*,” for which, the forms of prayer are especially appointed; as their name imports; as the Rubrics assert; and as the lessons for every day in the month imply.

Another distinguishing practice, is in the especial regard they pay to saints days and holy days; for all which, particular provision is made in the services and regulations of the Prayer Book.

A third distinguishing practice of the Puseyites, against which great outcry is raised by men who uphold the Prayer Book, is that of placing candles on the altar; this is prescribed by the very first Rubric in the Prayer Book; and that book they all say, “containeth nothing contrary to God’s word.”

Clergymen may be mobbed, villified as dishonest to Protestantism, for these things; but the fact cannot be wiped out of the book; no Evangelical can “rail the seal from off his bond.”

It may be unscriptural, foolish, superstitious, Popish; but there it stands in the Prayer Book; and the following letter in defence of these candles, may be condemned, but it cannot be answered except by putting down the Prayer Book, and taking up the Bible.

“MY DEAR BRETHREN,

“Having received from an anonymous Donor a Pair of Altar Candlesticks, accompanied with an earnest request that they might be placed on The Altar in St. Paul’s Church on Easter Sunday, (two lights on the Altar being moreover enjoined by the Rubric in our Prayer Book,) I do not feel at liberty, were I disposed to do so, to refuse compliance with the Donor’s request.

“At the same time, being well aware how strong is the prejudice, from whatever cause arising, against Lights on the Altar, I feel it my duty, (and great will be my pleasure if I succeed,) to endeavour to remove every antagonistic feeling to such ornaments, by proving to you that Lights on the Altar are enjoined by a Rubric in our Prayer Book, sanctioned by Convocation and Act of Parliament.

“The Rubric is as follows: ‘And here it is to be noted, that such ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their Ministration, shall be retained, and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the Authority of Parliament, in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth.’ To know then what are the ornaments of the Church which the Prayer Book orders to be in all Churches, we have only to refer to the Act just mentioned, that ratifies the King’s injunctions, in which, in the clause against Popish Torches and Tapers before Images and Shrines, we read that ‘Ministers shall suffer from henceforth no Torches nor Candles, Tapers or Images of wax, to be set

afore any Image or Picture, *but only two lights upon the High Altar*, before the sacrament, which, for the signification that Christ is the very true light of the world, they shall suffer to remain still.' And in Archbishop Cranmer's articles of visitation, in the same year, the following inquiry was made at all the Churches in the Diocese of Canterbury, 'Whether they suffer any Torches, Candles, Tapers, or any other lights to be in their Churches, but only two lights upon the High Altar.'

"I will add one passage from Wheatley's Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer, a work held in high estimation by all Churchmen, as an authority in questions relating to the Rubric.

"In speaking of this first Rubric he says, 'I must observe still farther, that among other ornaments of the Church then in use, there were two lights enjoined by injunctions of King Edward the Sixth, (which injunctions were also ratified by the Act of Parliament here mentioned,) to be set upon the Altar, as a significant ceremony to represent the light which Christ's gospel brought into the world. And this too was ordered by the the very same injunction which prohibited all other lights and tapers, that used to be superstitiously set before images or shrines, &c. And these lights, used time out of mind in the Church, are still continued in most, if not all, Cathedral and Collegiate Churches and Chapels, so often as divine service is performed by candle-light; and ought also, by this Rubric, to be used in all Parish Churches and Chapels at the same times.'

"I trust, my brethren, that these few remarks on the subject of Altar Lights, may have the effect of preventing any hasty or intemperate condemnation of a practice sanctioned by the Church of England, before and since the Reformation, even to the present day.

"Your faithful Pastor,

"GEO. B. P. LATIMER.

"*Easter Even.* 1851.

"ST. PAUL'S, BIRMINGHAM."

But the main element confirmatory of Puseyism, in its stronghold respecting sacramental efficacy; IS THE SACERDOTAL OR PRIESTLY CHARACTER, recognized in the whole of the services, and provided for in the ceremonies of making, ordaining, and consecrating deacons, priests, and bishops.

The doctrine of a priesthood, is a complete defence of Puseyism. Some we know deny that there are priests in the Church of England, in the Romish sense of the word; but that the Anglican use of the term priest, is only a contraction of presbyter.

This question of words and names makes no difference; we know that only one order is called priest, and is called so in imitation of Rome; but every order is actually a priesthood, as *possessing a peculiar sanctity and power*, residing in a distinct body of men; communicated by predecessors in the same orders; and without which they can neither preach the word, consecrate elements, administer sacraments, nor bury the dead.

Now if "the Prayer Book containeth nothing contrary to the word of God," it follows that priestly power and not spiritual religion constitutes Christianity; and so again the Puseyites are supported by the Prayer Book: for they insist mainly on Baptism, &c., by one validly ordained.

That this sacerdotal power, or priestly function, is the doctrine of the Prayer Book, we shall prove in two ways:—

(1.) From the ritual of the making, ordaining, and consecrating of deacons, priests and bishops.

(2.) From services they are entitled to perform, through this ordination, &c.

1. We shall examine first, the ordering of priests and deacons, and the consecration of bishops.

The preface of these forms declares, that from "Scripture and the ancient authors," "it is evident there have been from the Apostles' times these orders," and that no man might execute their offices without this ordination by "lawful authority."

And that in the "Church of England and Ireland, no man be allowed to execute any of the said functions, except he be admitted thereunto according to the form herein-after following, or hath had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination."

Here is the *sacredness of*, and the exclusive right of, a sacerdotal or priestly caste to minister in the church.

The episcopal or bishop-ordination, may be had before-hand in the Church of Rome, and then a priest or bishop of Rome may be received into the same offices in the English Church; but if the most useful and honoured minister amongst any Dissenters, were to join the Church, he would not be sacred enough to do any office in the English Church, without being re-ordained by a bishop. His orders would be ignored; his previous right to preach or baptize, or bury, or administer the Lord's Supper would be denied, *and he would for the first time receive PRIESTLY AUTHORITY*. Such is the theory and the practice of the English Protestant Church.

How then is the sacerdotal power conveyed?

"First the Archdeacon, or his deputy, shall present unto the bishop (*sitting in his chair near to the HOLY TABLE*) such as desire to be ordained deacons, (each of them being *decently* habited,) saying these words:—Reverend Father in God, I present unto you these persons present, to be admitted deacons."

And after many questions and answers, all set down and printed *verbatim*, beforehand, (so that anybody could go through it;) with some prescribed devotions,

"Then the bishop laying his hand severally upon the head of every one of them, humbly kneeling before him, shall say, '*take thou authority to execute the office of deacon in the Church of God, committed unto thee; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.*'"

Then shall the bishop deliver to every one of them the N. T. saying, "*take thou authority to read the gospel in the Church of God, and to preach in the same, if thou be licensed thereto by the bishop himself.*"

This is the lowest grade of ministry; accordingly only a few things are allowed to be done by a deacon. He may read the Bible in the Church, *which a Scripture reader may not do*. It appears to have been a practice, and perhaps is now, for the deacon to omit the *absolution* when he reads the morning and evening service, since *he is not yet high*

enough to have power to forgive sins. Wheatley on the Book of Common Prayer defends this omission, on the ground that none lower than a priest has a right to proclaim absolution!

And after the authority given to read the Bible in the Church, the bishop prays that the deacons "may so well behave themselves in *this inferior office*, that they may be found worthy to be called unto the *higher ministries*." Which means a fuller possession of priestly power. The *deacon* is *not* endowed with the Holy Ghost, by the imposition of the bishop's hands. And this is why he has less sacerdotal power.

The authority is therefore raised higher, in the next step called *priests orders*; though here as before, the bishop *sits in his chair near to the holy table*.

After certain questions the oath of supremacy and prayers, the bishop proceeds to impart mystical virtue to the priest.

"When this prayer is done, the bishop with the priests present shall lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receiveth the order of priesthood; the *receivers humbly kneeling*, and the bishop saying — 'RECEIVE THE HOLY GHOST for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.'"

This false and blasphemous use of Scripture, (assuming the very place of Christ himself, and giving Apostolic power,) is omitted in the ordering of deacons, who consequently cannot forgive sins, nor even pronounce the general absolution.

Whilst a deacon may read the Scriptures in the Church, (a consecrated man, in a consecrated building,) the priest is further addressed by the bishop thus: "Take thou authority to *preach* the word of God, and to *minister the holy sacraments* in the congregation where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto."

The consecrating of a bishop, is accompanied with a still more emphatic declaration of the bestowal of the Holy Ghost. And since this office of a bishop, is higher than that of a priest, allowing a still further exercise of sacerdotal power, (namely for ordinary priests, confirming children and consecrating churches and burial grounds) there is both greater pomp and circumstance in the consecration to this order, as well as higher dignities engaged in it.

The bishops, aided by priests, can make a priest; but the archbishop, aided by bishops, must engage in consecrating a bishop. As follows,—

"Then the archbishop and bishops present, shall lay their hands upon the head of the *elected bishop kneeling before them upon his knees*, the archbishop saying,—

'RECEIVE THE HOLY GHOST for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee, by the imposition of our hands; *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. Amen. And remember that thou stir up the *grace of God which is given unto thee by this imposition of our hands*.'"

We find then, in the first place, the elements of sacerdotalism, or peculiar priestly power, recognized in the forms of making, ordering, and

consecrating deacons, priests, and bishops. It is this priestly power, which is the foundation of Puseyism.

Secondly, this priestly character is equally manifest in the method and circumstances as well as the nature of those functions, to which men are introduced by these priestly orders.

Notice then, especially, with what distinctness of spiritual caste this magical power is exercised.

After general confession, in the morning and evening prayers, in which confession the priest, like the people, kneels; there is this direction:—*“the absolution or remission of sins is to be pronounced BY THE PRIEST ALONE STANDING, the people still kneeling.”*

This is to express the authority of the priest, as standing in God's place, whilst the people humbly kneel to hear the priest proclaim that God *“hath given power and commandment to his ministers* to pronounce to his people being penitent, the absolution and remission of sins.”

Thus he enters on the priestly office, by doing what a deacon is not allowed to do; by acting on a commission connected with the gift of inspiration to the Apostles, and in a way in which the Apostles never exercised their authority!

In the “forms of prayer to be used at sea,” there is a general confession to be made in case of “imminent danger;” this is followed by a form of absolution, or assurance of pardon to the penitent; but the poor sailors are to have no comfort from their petitions, if there is no priest to declare the absolution with authority. This is a shameful illustration of sacerdotalism. The Prayer Book direction in the imminent danger, after the confession of sin, thus proceeds:—

“Then shall the priest, IF THERE BE ANY in the ship, pronounce the the absolution.”

But what if there be no priest in the ship? *Then*, of course, no one has power to declare that God's word of grace may be relied on! Christ himself can do nothing in the way of salvation, without a priest.

The same extraordinary authority, giving validity to the divine promises, by the vain breath of a man, is involved in the *priest alone standing* while all the people kneel, at the absolution in the morning and evening prayers of the Church.

He stands because he is a priest; the people kneel and dare not stand—because they are (not sons but) slaves. The priest is *above* them, their comfort is in his authority: *then* may they rise, when *he* has declared them absolved.

“Here all the people standing up, the priest shall say” these Apocryphal words, (ordered to be *sung* at the end of every reading of the Psalms, as well as *said* in this place,) *“Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. Answer—As it was in the beginning, &c.”*

In this method of declaring absolution then, as first the exclusive work and power of a priest, he alone standing, we see how that he enters on the exercise of his sacerdotal office, *by declaring with professional authority*, with grave and solemn preliminaries, *what any infant may declare with equal power, certainty and propriety.*

Besides the first grave office of absolution in the daily morning and

evening prayers, the priest is "to declare to the people (during the communion service) what holydays or fasting days are in the week following to be observed:" this direction of the Prayer Book (if honestly followed) would provide *special services* for nearly every day in the year.

After the sermon, or homily, (on communion days,) "the priest shall return to the Lord's table and begin *the offertory*;" that is, the service of religious almsgiving during the Lord's supper.

Many Puseyites are blamed for this service, as an "innovation," and a relic of Popery; but there are sentences of Scripture appointed to be read, a method of collection and presentation, together with a prayer for acceptance;—all provided in that book, respecting which every clergyman declares that "*it containeth nothing contrary to the word of God.*"

What then does this infallible book contain on this subject of the "*offertory*" service, as a part of the administration of the Lord's Supper?

First, appointed passages of Scripture, amongst which are "the tares also;" namely *two verses out of TOBIT*, iv.!

"Whilst these sentences are in reading, the deacons, churchwardens, or other fit person appointed for that purpose, shall receive *the alms* for the poor, and OTHER DEVOTIONS of the people, in a decent basin, to be provided by the parish for that purpose: and *reverently* bring it to the priest, who shall humbly present and place it upon the holy table."*

Here note the sacerdotal character of the whole scene; neither churchwarden nor deacon, may *present* the offerings on the sacred table: it is an act of priestly oblation!

After *humbly presenting and placing* the basin on the sacred table; the priest prays that God will mercifully "accept our alms and oblations."

Not only is there this "*offertory*" service, in its full Puseyite development to be found in the communion service; but CONFESSION also is recommended in the same service: on the same grounds exactly as that on which Papists defend that abuse.

"And because it is requisite that no man should come to the holy communion, but with *full trust in God's mercy* and with a quiet conscience;—therefore if there be any who by this means cannot quiet his conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, *let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned MINISTER* of God's word, that by the ministry of God's holy word, [*i.e.* by the priests] he may *receive the benefit of ABSOLUTION*." So will he become certain of God's favour, "all of whose promises" according to *this* book, "are yea and amen, in" the priest.

This confession and absolution are more fully enforced in the "visitation of the sick." Where we read—

"Then shall the minister examine whether he repent him truly of his sins, &c.

Here shall the sick person *be moved to make* A SPECIAL CONFESSION OF HIS SINS, if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. *After which confession, the priest SHALL ABSOLVE* him, (if he humbly and heartily desire it,) *after this sort*—

* The Communion Service: Prayer Book.

‘Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to *his Church* (!) to absolve all sinners, who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences: And I BY HIS AUTHORITY COMMITTED UNTO ME,* ABSOLVE THEE *from all thy sins*, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.’”

Thus is the doctrine of special confession, and priestly absolution, contained in that Book, which all Evangelical ministers declare “containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God.”

The same spiritual conjuring by the exercise of priestly power, is apparent in the *consecration of the elements*, in the Lord’s supper, a phrase altogether unscriptural and superstitious.

No layman, no Scripture reader, not even a deacon, can perform this miracle. “When the priest, *standing* before the table, hath so ordered the bread and wine, that he may with more readiness and *decency* break the bread before the people, and *take the cup into his hands*, he shall say the PRAYER OF CONSECRATION as followeth.”

At one part of the prayer it is thus prescribed:—

“Here the priest is to take the paten into his hands;” and again, “here to break the bread;” and again, “here to *lay his hands upon ALL the bread:*” i. e. that it may *all* be consecrated! A further direction of like sort, in connection with this “prayer of consecration,” is “And here to *lay his hand upon EVERY vessel* (be it chalice or flagon) in which there is any wine to be consecrated.”

All this is in that book, which is declared to “contain in it nothing contrary to the word of God.”

He who *stands* to perform this Scriptural ceremony of consecrating the elements, touching all the vessels with sacred and consecrating hands, is just beforehand directed to “kneel,” while “in the name of all that receive the communion,” he makes a confession of guilt; but when in *his own name* he enacts the “prayer of consecration,” he “stands,” by right of official authority.

So effectual is his consecration of the elements, that like the priest himself, they may be put to no other than a religious use. As indeed we have heard of some consistent Anglican priests destroying poor people’s best basin, after a private baptism, lest the sacred vessel should be desecrated by being sacrilegiously used for unconsecrated sugar. Should there be too little bread or wine consecrated, at the commencement of the service, the priest is to say “the form prescribed” over additional elements, “for *the blessing of the bread*,” and “for the blessing of the cup.”

Which blessing, though unscriptural (*since our Lord blessed God, and not the bread and wine*), is yet effectual by priestly power: insomuch, that any consecrated bread or wine remaining after the sacrament, is like the basin, defended from profane uses.

“When all have communicated, the minister shall return to the Lord’s table and *reverently place* upon it, what remaineth of the consecrated elements, *covering the same* with a fair linen cloth.”

These sacred relics, are thus to be disposed of,—“and if any remain of that which hath been consecrated, IT SHALL NOT BE CARRIED OUT OF

* When was this authority committed to thee? P. D.

THE CHURCH, but the priest and such other communicants as he shall then call unto him, *shall immediately*, after the blessing, REVERENTLY EAT AND DRINK THE SAME."

The sacrament of baptism, contains an equal if not greater manifestation of the sacerdotal power; the right to administer it, is obtained in the ordination of a priest: the effect of its administration, is to confer "forgiveness of sins, by spiritual regeneration." Since after having prayed for this result, and that "this infant may be born again by the Holy Spirit, and made an heir of everlasting salvation," and that God would "*sanctify this water* to the mystical washing away of sin;"—it is declared "that this child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church."

Accordingly, after having pronounced this result to the people, the priest shall say,—

"We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit, and to receive him for thy own child by adoption, &c."

Such are the prayers, assertions, and thanksgivings, contained in the service of baptism, in that book which "containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God."

We say nothing here of sponsors, promising in the child's name; this may be Scriptural, if the Scripture supports it; but we confine ourselves to the sacerdotal efficacy of the rite. Baptismal regeneration, denied by every Evangelical in his preaching, supported in preaching by every Puseyite, is in the Prayer Book, which they all use, and declare to be Scriptural: it is in the Catechism, which they all teach for confirmation;—"wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." This is the easiest way of gaining an inheritance, that has yet been discovered. But is it not in the Prayer Book? Yes! Is it in the Bible? No.

Where did it come from? The Pope. Where does it lead to? The Pope. So important and efficacious is this rite, according to the Prayer Book, that a *form of baptizing in a hurry* is appointed, lest the child should die first! And hence the general superstition of the people who are exposed to this priestly influence,—though they know nothing else, they know thus much of *Christianity* (?)—that a sick child is not safe for heaven till it is baptized.

The form of hasty baptism, demands a *lawful minister*, i. e. one recognized by the Prayer Book; that is, one ordained as a priest, by a bishop. All these must concur to save a poor child, whom our blessed Lord would take to his arms, even if unbaptized, as he did when on earth.

But though a form is prescribed for an emergency, yet should the child recover, it must be taken to Church, and have the validity of its baptism examined and attested.

Why all this carefulness? Because baptism is here the door of salvation; and accordingly, whilst providing a quick process for such as are in danger, we are told that "it is certain by God's word,* that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are saved."—(End of baptismal service.)

* Where is the question mentioned in God's word? P. D.

This supposes that children not so baptized, are lost; hence the eagerness to provide a short form to save sick children.

And consistently with this principle, **THE FONT IS THE ONLY ESSENTIAL PREPARATION FOR THE BURIAL SERVICE.** It is the gate of heaven, and of the consecrated ground. "For being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby [*i. e.* by baptism] made the children of grace."—(*The Catechism.*) It is by this engrafting into the Church, that we are in a state of salvation, and hence are fit to have the burial service read over us.

This burial service is made on the supposition that we are rightly baptized, and "thereby" truly saved.

Hence a clergyman may consistently, and if he believe the Prayer Book according to his ordination vow, he must conscientiously, not only refuse to bury unbaptized persons, but all who have not been baptized by the valid priesthood as recognized in the Prayer Book.

The Puseyite clergy, do act upon one part of this rule, namely, they refuse to bury such as have not been baptized at all.

For this, they are of course condemned, and that by many churchmen; but let such persons read the following notice, prefixed as a warning at the beginning of the burial service.

"Here is to be **NOTED**, that the office ensuing, is **NOT to be used** FOR ANY THAT DIE UNBAPTIZED; or excommunicate, or have laid violent hands on themselves."

Baptism is therefore the only essential condition; this admits to the Church: excommunication, which turns out of the Church, is but annulling the benefits of baptism.

So then we are buried in the "sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life," on the sole ground of the priestly efficacy of the sacrament of baptism.

Thus is the Tractarian or Puseyite principle,—pre-eminently termed **THE SACRAMENTAL SYSTEM**,—the doctrine of the Prayer Book.

In all these matters thus noted, we have seen the peculiar exercise of a priestly power, which power is conferred by episcopal ordination: without which ordination, no man may administer the sacraments, without which sacraments, no man may be saved.

In this, and in more, the Puseyites are vindicated by the Prayer Book; which all the Evangelicals together with themselves, declare at their ordination "containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God." See Canon 36th, which they all sign "willingly and *ex animo*"—with all their heart.

Let the laity look to this, and not vainly expend their anger on Puseyites, whilst they join the Evangelicals in extolling "our Prayer Book," which justifies the Puseyites in all they do.

Our two further propositions,—that *Puseyism naturally leads to Rome*; and that *we therefore require a reformation out of the Bible*, not out of the remnants of superstition;—will be more quickly despatched.

Secondly then, we assert that this sacramental system, naturally, consistently, and necessarily, leads to Rome.

We need not wonder at the number of conversions to Rome; we should rather be surprised that they are so few.

Suppose men at this day, with the general doctrines called Evangelical, and with the Bible as their only standard, were to construct a system of religious worship and policy for themselves, is it likely that any one of the elements we have animadverted on, would be introduced?

Whence then have these originated? Plainly from the Roman Ritual and Mass Book; to which everything may be traced.

From Rome, comes the method of ordering and consecrating deacons, priests, and bishops: the forms of absolution; the urging of confession; the doctrine of baptismal regeneration—the entire system of priesthood and sacramentalism.

Then let any one read the *Calendar*, with its tables of saints and days prefixed to the Prayer Book; and say whether it would not require more spare time than people can give to religion, to know the history of these saints and the reasons for such days.

That no saint may be overlooked, though we have some specially mentioned of whom nobody knows anything—we have in addition, a day for “All Saints,” &c. But what is more astonishing, is, that these Apocryphal saints, have also APOCRYPHAL SCRIPTURES to keep them in countenance.

Lessons in the Calendar from that very Apocrypha on which Rome founds some of her notions.

The Homilies also very frequently refer to the Apocrypha in support of doctrines; and these Homilies are subscribed to, as well as the Prayer Book, by the clergy.

And in the fourth of the XXXIX Articles, *two books of the Apocrypha are given as canonical*, whilst all the others are referred to by name, as to be read by the Church “for example of life, and instruction of manners.” Accordingly they occur frequently in the lessons, (see the Calendar,) and are quoted in the Homilies; as well as in the *communion service*.

The feasts and fasts are taken from Rome; and many have directly Roman meanings, implied in their very names.

The following days of fasting or abstinence, look strange in a Protestant Prayer Book.

I. The forty days of Lent. [Why *forty days* no one can tell.]

II. The Ember days. [The origin and meaning of which name is not decided.]

III. The three Rogation days.

IV. *All the FRIDAYS in the year.* Except Christmas day.”

Many simple people imagine that it is the peculiarity of the Catholic to abstain from meat every Friday; but *this is the common discipline of Rome and England.* It is one of the Prayer Book regulations.

The four “solemn days” of Gunpowder Plot, the martyrdom of Charles I., birth and return of Charles II., and the Coronation of the Reigning Monarch, are perhaps *the only Protestant days* which the English Church has adopted.

THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS and ANGELS may be defended from the Prayer Book, first, by the respect paid to them in a day and a church consecrated to their honour; and a collect or prayer celebrating their names: whilst secondly, this practice is almost imitated, certainly palliated, by the following “collect,” headed, “*Saint (?) Michael and all angels.*”

"O everlasting God, who hast ordained and constituted the services of Angels and men in a wonderful order; mercifully grant, that as thy holy angels alway do thee service in heaven, so, by thy appointment, THEY MAY SUCCOUR AND DEFEND US *on earth*; through Jesus Christ our Lord."

The *Canticle* to be used at discretion instead of *Te Deum*, in the morning service, contains after some over-done poetical imitations of the Psalmist, calling upon all the elements to praise the Creator;—the following,—"*O Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, bless ye the Lord, praise him and magnify him for ever.*"

We are perhaps only exposing our Protestant ignorance, when we confess our non-acquaintance with these three worthies; and any reasons for their being specially called upon in public prayer.

Such things border so closely on Romish invocations, that whoever can heartily join in these, cannot logically refrain from going the entire length.

And, indeed, the strongest arguments of Romanists against the Church of England, are drawn from her own system.

The famous "letter from Rome, shewing an exact conformity between Popery and Paganism," by Dr. Conyers Middleton, could not have been answered had he been a Dissenter; but since he belonged to the Church of England; a Roman doctor has answered, by shewing that "the same arguments would prove an exact conformity between the Church of England and Popery."

Thus is the Churchman silenced, when a Protestant Dissenter would be triumphant.

This Roman author thus argues, taking up those points in which Dr. Middleton had proved the agreement between Romanism and Paganism:—by the same reasoning, the Church of England is in exact conformity with the Church of Rome:—

1. In the same churches; or new ones dedicated to Popish saints, which is a greater honour than desiring their prayers.

2. ALTARS *in their churches*; before which they *kneel*; though they have no sacrifice, and disbelieve in the real presence. *The sign of the cross*, without which none is rightly baptized.

3. "Their liturgy and common prayer is wholly Popish, at best a bungling imitation of the Romish mass: from this they have borrowed their collects, lessons, &c., and a great part of the communion service. Their orders of bishops, priests, and deacons, were taken from Rome, and from thence they pretend to derive their ordination. Their way of ordaining ministers resembles that of Papists," even to the gift of the Holy Ghost. Their surplices are rags of Rome, &c.

4. "Their Church government by archbishops and bishops; spiritual courts, deans, archdeacons, &c. Confirmation, priestly absolution in the visitation of the sick, where they prescribe auricular confession and a form of absolution, in substance the same as that used in the Church of Rome."

5. Their regards (paid by kneeling,) to the consecrated elements.

6. "Days, like Papists, in honour of saints and angels; which if it be not religious worship, I know what it is. Their collect for Michaelmas day, prays to be defended by angels. Their Calendar is full of Popish

saints. They prescribe fasts, like Papists, and from them have taken into their books the fasts of Lent, Vigils, Ember days, and Fridays," &c. &c.

Thus safely can the Romanist retort on the Anglican, so does he blunt the arrows of the best equipped controversialist.

They must be clean, who bear the vessels of the Lord: the physician must first heal himself: first cast out the beam that is in thine own eye.

These principles which come from Rome, lead to Rome: but especially the grand central doctrine of *the priesthood*, which is the essence of Popery.

In this source of *ordination-power*, which England received from Rome, and which she still recognizes, in Rome, we find the grand source of conversion amongst her consistently sacramentarian clergy. They say only one Church can have the Comforter with it; the power of conferring sacerdotal consecration, on which the saving efficacy of baptism and other rites depends.

Therefore, they look for such a Church; and find that Rome, (from which England has accepted so much,) is also by England recognized as having this present divinity, and therefore from the leadings of the English Church, they find rest in the Romish communion. This is the condensed history of all clerical conversions.

This true Church, which has authority conveyed down from the beginning, to confer these wonderful priestly gifts, is what all these men grope after: as the converts plainly declare.

The Rev. W. H. Anderton, in a farewell letter to his late parishioners, (of St. Margaret's, Leicester,) professes to have found the source of the sacramental Nile;—or rather, the true fountain of healing waters of which all the clergy aim to drink at ordinations, and there fill their pitcher with gracious powers for their spiritual functions of baptism, confirmation and absolution.

This fountain, poor Anderton finds under Peter's chair, whence it flows through all valid ecclesiastical channels; to exude from the fingers of a bishop, and distil from the lips of a priest *so* qualified. If this unfortunate gentleman seems madder than his late Anglican brethren, it is only because he is more methodical;—a more logical lunatic: they trust to moonshine, but he thinks a trip to the moon, more healing and safe.

We are not disposed to follow him, on the contrary, we are anxious to remove the balloon which periodically carries these deluded passengers.

But we must *defer the conclusion of this subject to our next number*: in which we shall notice some manifestoes of the converts from England to Rome. Meanwhile we may observe that these converts to Rome from the Church of England, will not do as a Roman doctor magnanimously ascribes to Luther,—drag down with them more than a third of the stars of heaven;—the movement back to Rome, will not at all disturb the current of society; it reaches not to the masses of the people: it forms no fearful and attractive vortex to force all the vessels within the sweep of the horizon to dance around this whirlpool, and finally to become engulfed. It all depends upon churchmen themselves, to frustrate this movement; by listening to their true friends. We trust that it will simply lead people to wake up and wonder how these men found their way to Rome; and finding that they have only followed a thread which the

Romans left behind them, along which thread these poor men have groped with a marvellous purblind consistency, we shall have simply to cut the thread;—to dissolve the connexion for ever;—and reverse the state of things which allows four and twenty prelates to declare in the face of all Protestant England—that “the Church before and after the Reformation is undoubtedly identical.”*

It must no longer be identical; Rome must no longer be allowed to hide her leaven in the Protestants’ three measures of meal. We are told that the cuckoo, whose note is so cheerful and captivating, is after all a cunning and cruel bird; laying eggs in the nests of our true British songsters, to be first hatched by them, and then to destroy their foster parents and the true progeny.

We must remove those seeds, which Popery has thus left behind; entirely “cast out the bondwoman and her son,” that we may not all be brought into slavery.

In other words, we must have a *complete BIBLE REFORMATION*. We must no more remodel the Mass Book, and cry out against those who are more consistent to the remnants of Popery than their neighbours.

We cannot remove the men, till we have removed the principles: they argue from the Prayer Book, we must take away their premises, or we cannot gainsay their conclusion. We condemn Puseyites, let us abolish Puseyism; and then we shall be consistent.

Let Churchmen be assured, that if they set down these undoubted truths to the bitterness of Dissent, they will lose the grand advantage of this crisis; and instead of preserving their Church as a bulwark against Rome, they will build up the citadel of Romanism in the Church itself, till all places of honour and emolument being in the hands of Puseyites, and a liberal or latitudinarian Government being in power, first, Catholicism will be established in Ireland, and secondly, *acknowledged* in England.

Then cometh the end—in such a convulsion as will shake down all the battlements of tyranny: then will liberty and conscience *know their enemies*; and the slowly but surely gathering forces of light and truth,—the education of centuries; in which alone a nation comes to years of discretion—will be seen in grand (it may be terrible) collision with the consolidated hosts of tyranny and bondage: such a crisis would be dreadful, though the issue cannot be doubtful. For the world still moves on, and man must be free. May this advance be *peaceful*, let there be no vain but irritating impediment, lest the waters of this river collecting *there* in resistless force, where they seem to have been checked, should suddenly as “with a flood” carry away all the mounds of false authority, and create a new earth, by the desolation of the old.

* See the Address of the Prelates, in our last number: “Mene, Mene, &c.”

III.

STATESMEN'S RELIGION.

"EVERY PLANT WHICH MY HEAVENLY FATHER HATH NOT PLANTED, SHALL BE ROOTED UP."—(Matt. xv. 13.)

In those who think a national Church right, dissent is a sin ; in those who think it wrong, silence is a shame.

CHURCH EXTENSION.

The following modest recommendations, having been presented by the Church Commissioners ; we beg to present them to our readers, with the comments of Publicola, published in the *Weekly Dispatch*, May 11th, 1851.

The courteous reader is requested to form his own judgment, both of the text and the sermon. Both are worthy of preservation.

A MODEST PROPOSAL ; PAROCHIAL EXTENSION.

The following is a copy of the address on parochial extension, presented to her Majesty by the Archbishop of Canterbury, April 14th, 1851 :—

" TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

The humble Address of the undersigned Prelates, Lords of your Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, and others, Members of the United Church of England and Ireland,

SHOWETH,—That in many parts of England and Wales, where the population has outgrown *the provisions originally made by the Church* for the religious instruction of the people, there is an absolute and immediate necessity for an extension of the parochial system.

Great as the undertaking may be, and difficult as it may seem to make the parochial and ecclesiastical system adequate to the exigencies of the times, the Church, it is believed, possesses *in her temporalities, and in the wealth and liberality of her members, resources sufficient*, if properly drawn out and applied, *to afford spiritual instruction to the whole* of the nation, insomuch that in a few years there need be "no sheep without a fold, nor any fold without a shepherd."

It has been ascertained by your Majesty's "Commissioners appointed to enquire into the practicability and mode of sub-dividing all densely-peopled parishes in England and Wales," that there is *a pressing demand for the erection of 600 new churches*, which should, in most cases, have parishes assigned to them, and these, of course, *involve the appointment of one clergyman at least to each* ; 600 additional churches, therefore, with as many clergymen attached to them, is the first great want towards rendering effective our parochial system. It is estimated by your Majesty's Commissioners *that these Churches would cost, on an average,*

£3,000 each, if built in that simple ecclesiastical style, both internally and externally, which suits the dignified simplicity of our reformed worship. *The total cost of those 600 sacred edifices would, therefore, amount to £2,100,000.* The Commissioners are of opinion that if a sum of about £1,000,000 sterling could be supplied from some general fund, local subscriptions and the liberality of Churchmen (as experience hitherto has shown) would supply the rest.

Again, *to provide every clergyman with a stipend of £200 per annum, would require an income of £120,000, and to endow every church with £50 a year more, for the maintenance of the fabric, would require an additional yearly sum of £30,000; £150,000 a year, therefore, must be provided for the support of the 600 new churches and their officiating ministers; but, further, it would be desirable in all cases, and in some, necessary, to attach residences, or parsonage-houses, to the new parishes.* In many cases, where the labours of a faithful pastor were duly valued by his flock, it might be expected that a residence would be provided for him, but taking each parsonage-house to cost, on an average, £800, a sum of £120,000 (*supposing a like sum were granted by the bounty board*) would be sufficient to make a grant of half the cost of each parsonage, leaving the rest to the liberality of the congregation.

The founding of schools for the poor in every new parish and district will follow as a matter of course upon the erection of the church and the appointment of a minister. For this important object, the Committee of your Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council on Education, will be ready to contribute its aid; and with the help of local resources and other contributions it might reasonably be expected to see, in a few years, increased school accommodation for more than 200,000 children.

An important class of men, which has lately been introduced into the Church with the sanction of the bishops, will not be omitted in any scheme for extending parochial efficiency; the Scripture reader is now acknowledged to be a valuable auxiliary to the clergyman—his salary is from £50 to £70 a year; and if even there were no public funds available for introducing 1,000 such men into the new-formed parishes, it might safely be left to the laity, in their respective districts, to furnish the small stipends required for these useful agents. From the same source would flow free-will offerings sufficient to maintain with food, shelter and clothing, godly women who might be disposed to undertake to visit the dwellings of the poor, to soothe the hours of sickness, to take the neglected children by the hand and conduct them to the school, and to supply what is wanting in our district visiting associations.

We do not undertake to set forth at any length the resources by which these important objects may be accomplished; the intention of this paper is mainly to lay before your Majesty the wants of the population. At the same time, we may properly refer to the two reports recently issued from the two Royal Commissions, one of which was appointed to enquire into the state of the property of the Church, the other into the means of increasing its efficiency. These reports suggest several measures, too complicated to be here stated in detail, by which a large amount of money, both in capital and revenue, might be obtained for the purposes contemplated.

In the first place, it is proposed, that *the patronage of a portion of the benefices in the gift of the Lord High Chancellor of England* should be resigned in favour of the proposed new parishes, and *the value of the advowsons* applied in successive years to the erection of churches.

Should this be considered inexpedient, and the whole of the Lord Chancellor's patronage be retained, the undersigned would humbly express a hope that *some other mode* may be devised *by the wisdom* of your Majesty's Government, for *giving the Church*, where her ministrations are needed, the full benefit of these resources.

It is also shown, on the same authority, that *by a better system of managing Church property*, not less than £500,000. per annum might be obtained, in the course of a few years, for the support of the additional clergymen which our crowded towns and widely-extended parishes require.

The *overwhelming* duties which now devolve upon some of the bishop's (owing to the enlarged population and the happy circumstances of an increase also in the number of clergy,) appear to make it *desirable that there should be a corresponding increase in the episcopate*; and if your Majesty in your wisdom should see fit to recommend such a measure, *the revenue and residence of the deanery*, in some places might be made available, where fitting circumstances concur.

The foregoing suggestions however, for the extension of the parochial system, look not only to the actual resources of the Church, but to the liberality of her members. It rests with your Majesty's Government to set the scheme in motion, it will remain for the people to press it forward; and if, in the localities where these contemplated churches are to be founded, one-half of the first cost should be supplied or procured by the congregations, *it would be in accordance with the spirit of the Church Building Acts of Parliament, that, if it were desired, the subscribers to a certain amount should have a voice in the nomination* of the ministers, but in such a manner as *to avoid the evils of a popular election*. If the blessed truths of the Gospel, and its civilising influences, can be brought within the reach of the great masses of our labouring population, *no slight objections, arising from mere secular considerations*, should arrest the steps of a Christian Government; and no sacrifice should be considered too great to be made on the part of a Christian people.

The undersigned, in presenting this *humble* memorial to your Majesty, are far from presuming to take upon themselves the office of advisers, nor would they be understood as expressing an opinion on all the details of the recommendations of your Majesty's Commissioners; but they respectfully submit that the suggestions embodied in this address may be worthy of your Majesty's consideration, and they humbly offer their loyal co-operation with your Majesty's Government to promote those measures, and draw forth those resources of benevolence which cannot fail, by God's blessing, to confer an inestimable benefit upon the spiritually-destitute thousands of immortal souls.

Archbishop of Canterbury
Archbishop of York
Duke of Bedford
Duke of Marlborough

Duke of Manchester
Marquis of Cholmondeley
Marquis of Londonderry
Marquis of Westminster

Marquis of Blandford, M.P.
 Marquis of Douro, M. P.
 Viscount Mandeville, M. P.
 Earl of Denbigh
 Earl of Winchelsea
 Earl of Macclesfield
 Earl Waldegrave
 Earl Fitzwilliam
 Earl Talbot
 Earl Cadogan
 Earl of Bandon
 Earl of Harrowby
 Earl of Verulam
 Earl Howe
 Earl of Effingham
 Earl of Enniskillen
 Earl of Lanesborough
 Earl Jermyn
 Earl of Galloway
 Earl of Roden
 Earl of Cavan
 Viscount Castlereagh, M.P.
 Lord J. Manners, M.P.
 Viscount Sidney
 Viscount Lewton
 Viscount Emlyn, M.P.
 Viscount Seaham, M.P.
 Viscount Ebrington, M.P.
 Viscount Lewisham, M.P.
 Lord Ashley, M.P.
 Lord Naas, M.P.
 Lord Barnard, M.P.
 Lord C. Hamilton, M.P.
 Lord R. Grosvenor, M.P.
 Bishop of Winchester
 Bishop of Lichfield
 Bishop of Llandaff
 Bishop of Norwich
 Bishop of Ripon
 Bishop of St. Asaph
 Bishop of St. David's
 Lord Auckland, Bishop of Sodor
 and Man
 Lord Clonbrock
 Lord Lyttleton
 Lord Churchill
 Lord Rayleigh
 Lord Feversham
 Lord Leigh
 Lord Wenlock

Lord Lifford
 Lord Teignmouth
 Lord Dufferin
 Lord Crofton
 C. S. Lefevre, Esq., M.P., Speaker
 Right Hon. S. Herbert, M.P.
 Hon. Capt. Pelham, R.N., M.P.
 Hon. A. Duncombe, M.P.
 Sir P. De Grey Egerton, Bart., M.P.
 Sir J. Y. Buller, Bart., M.P.
 Sir W. H. Joliffe, Bart., M.P.
 Sir H. Verney, Bart., M.P.
 Sir E. N. Buxton, Bart., M.P.
 Sir T. D. Acland, Bart., M.P.
 C. B. Adderley, Esq., M.P.
 W. Beckett, Esq., M.P.
 W. Beresford, Esq., M.P.
 J. W. Childers, Esq., M.P.
 Smith Child, Esq., M.P.
 R. A. Christopher, Esq., M.P.
 H. Currie, Esq., M.P.
 H. G. Cole, Esq., M.P.
 B. Disraeli, Esq., M.P.
 Wm. Forbes, Esq., M.P.
 C. H. Frewen, Esq., M.P.
 Gilbert Grenall, Esq., M.P.
 G. A. Hamilton, Esq., M.P.
 G. C. Legh, Esq., M.P.
 Walter Long, Esq., M.P.
 F. Mackenzie, Esq., M.P.
 R. D. Mangles, Esq., M.P.
 Wm. Miles, Esq., M.P.
 R. M. Milnes, Esq., M.P.
 C. A. Moody, Esq., M.P.
 J. K. Mullings, Esq., M.P.
 J. Napier, Esq., M.P.
 J. W. Patten, Esq., M.P.
 G. W. J. Repton, Esq., M.P.
 George Rushout, Esq., M.P.
 G. P. Scrope, Esq., M.P.
 R. B. Sheridan, Esq., M.P.
 John G. Smyth, Esq., M.P.
 T. H. S. Sotheron, Esq., M.P.
 A. Stafford, Esq., M.P.
 Alderman Sidney, M.P.
 Alderman Thompson, M.P.
 J. Tolkemache, Esq., M.P.
 S. H. Walpole, Esq., M.P.
 Loftus Wigram, Esq., M.P.
 W. Page Wood, Esq., M.P.

CHURCH AGGRESSION.

MR. EDITOR.—*Punch* exhibited, a few weeks since, Sir Charles Wood chloroforming John Bull with Window Tax Repeal, while Lord John Russell picked his pocket of a heavy purse, marked, "Income Tax." If *Punch's* Anti-Papal propensities, and his unusual sympathy with popular prejudices, have not quite blinded him to the enormities of that pseudo-Protestantism which is more formidable to the liberties and the pockets

of Englishmen than all the Popes that Italy can produce, or all the Cardinals that Popes can consecrate, he may vary the design so as to show the same suffering individual in peril of being victimised by sacerdotal hands, and robbed as largely while stupified by the din of Papal Aggression. The Marquis of Blandford is about to move the House of Commons to put into practical operation a scheme of Church Extension embodied in an "Address to her Majesty, of Prelates, Lords of her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, and others, Members of the United Church of England, and Ireland, on Church Extension, presented to her Majesty by his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury." The scheme is a colossal one. It dwarfs the Pope's hierarchy into insignificance. It meditates taking complete possession of the country by the Church. The proposition is a clerical invasion, and its accomplishment would be a clerical conquest. The locusts would overrun the land. People would be quashed like Saxons by the Normans. But I must put it in detail before your readers. They will see nothing so curious or so astounding in the Great Exhibition.

First of all, then, 600 new parishes are to be created, and a new church erected in each one of them. The 600 new churches are to be framed "in that simple ecclesiastical style, both internally and externally, which suits the dignified simplicity of our Reformed worship." Good heavens! what a deluge of modern Gothic. Every church is to be endowed with £50 a year, to keep it in repair. Of course there must be 600 clergymen, also to be endowed, so as to salary them with £200 a year each. Then the clergyman must have a house. Build that, allowing £800 as an average cost for the parsonages. Do not be fatigued yet, reader; "there's pippin's and cheese to come." Six hundred schools are to be built, at least; more, if necessary. Houses for the masters and mistresses are not mentioned—*de minimis non curat lex*—and, by analogy, the Church does not care for schoolmasters when Parsons are in question. Still, the schools will not work without this addition. Then, over the 600 parishes there are to be distributed 1,000 journeymen parsons, under the name of Scripture readers, with salaries from "£50 to £70 a year." These light infantry of the Church are to be backed by an indefinite number of camp followers, called "godly women," who are to be furnished "with food, shelter, and clothing," in order to visit the poor, "take the neglected children by the hand, and conduct them to school," with other avocations not very clearly described. To crown the whole, "a corresponding increase of the episcopate" is suggested. "Behold, the mighty fabric stands complete."

Why, Sir, if the Pope ignores the religion of the Anglican Church, in turn the Anglican Church ignores the religion of the nation. Is no man pious who does not frequent his parish church? Do thousands of dissenting chapels tell for nothing in the account? The approved clerical method pursued to form a basis for this gigantic project, is to number the population, measure the church room, and call the difference "spiritual destitution." There is no want whatever of new churches. Nobody who desires to attend public worship is prevented by the difficulty of finding accommodation. The "gates of gospel grace are open night and day," and you may generally get in without having to fight your way through

a crowd. Those who are much in want of parsonic services, are quite able to help themselves. The case is the same with church room and school room. It is easier to build than to fill. The schools already existing are not half occupied. This fact is proved numerically by the returns. Twenty per cent. were reported last year, by the inspectors as dead or dying. And the inspectors see the best schools, not the worst. Unlike the physician, they are called in to visit, not the feeblest, but the healthiest. As to the "readers," and their visitings, all the intelligent and independent operatives resent the impertinence of their intrusions. They tell them to pack elsewhere with their cant, bigotry, and palaver. The genus parson is a pestilential shrub enough in itself, but these fungi are perfectly intolerable.

Now, count the cost. I take the estimates from the Address itself, only capitalizing the proposed endowments at the rate of 5 per cent. :—

600 churches, £3,500 each	£2,100,000
Endowment for repairs	600,000
Do. for parsons	2,400,000
Parsonages	480,000
600 schools	360,000
Masters' houses, at £200 each	120,000
1,000 Scripture readers, say £60 salary, represents ...	1,200,000
600 "godly women" at say £30	360,000
Episcopate "to correspond," say five bishops, at £5,000 each, representing	500,000
	£8,120,000

Or, if we only take the capital outlay on the building of the churches, schools, and houses, we find it £3,060,000, and then an annual contribution remains to be furnished of—

Clergymen	£120,000
Church repairs	30,000
Scripture readers	60,000
Godly women	18,000
Bishops	25,000
	£253,000

Or, say a quarter of a million annually; and this leaves no provision for salaries of the schoolmasters and mistresses. Nor, indeed, does the Church allow either the income of the clergyman or the repairs of the fabric to depend upon the contingency of annual supplies. For these, endowments are required. Following this distribution, the capital outlay stands at £6,560,000; and the annual (excepting as before excepted, the schoolmasters, &c.) at £78,000. Any way, the project is a princely, or rather a pontifical one. Rome would furnish us with a whole hierarchy for the money. It is a Kaffir war five times told. Spiritual destitution threatens to swallow more than agricultural distress.

Where in the world is it supposed all this wealth is to come from? Has Episcopacy discovered a new California? Is there an Anglican bishop of El Dorado? Has Protestantism been favoured with a divine revelation of the philosopher's stone? The Bench declines being a Committee of Ways and Means:—"We do not undertake to set forth at length the resources by which these important objects may be accomplished." If not "at length," shall we have them in brief? A few hints

are forthcoming, partly taken from the Reports of the Commissions on Church Property, and on the means of increasing its efficiency. They are chiefly the sale of a portion of the benefices in the gift of the Lord Chancellor, and an improved administration of Church Property. For schools, the national grant is mainly looked to. And then the public is called on to subscribe. With magniloquent liberality, on the part of the people, it is declared that "no slight objections arising from mere secular considerations, should arrest the steps of a Christian Government, and no sacrifice should be considered too great to be made on the part of a Christian people." The new Church, then, would have voluntaryism and simony for its supporting pillars. Its Budget consists chiefly of two propositions: trade in livings, and beg for donations. The first tends to deepen one of the darkest blots by which the purity of a Church can be obscured. Purchaseable patronage is really selling what are deemed the most sacred things; it is free trade in the cure of souls; it opens a market for the alleged gifts of the Spirit, and vends them wholesale and retail to the highest bidder. Revolutionary Infidels commit no such desecration. They have melted bells for cannon, and sacramental cups for coinage, but they stop at the outer decorations of religion; they do not sell the power, under episcopal license, of guiding or misguiding the flock of Christ, of visiting it with "airs from heaven, or blasts from hell," and leading souls in the upward or downward road, as the case may happen. Patronage split the Church of Scotland; it will scarcely repair the Church of England.

I cannot put faith in the new-born faith of the bishops in the voluntary principle. It has left their schools aground, and will never float their Churches. The prelates put it forward, because something must be said. Financial resources for the scheme were too obvious a consideration to be passed over in silence. There is an ulterior thought in the minds of the movers. Huge Parliamentary grants of public money are looming in the distance. Once commence operations, and it is hoped that ministers and Parliament would not allow them to be suspended. Such tactics are continually played off upon the House of Commons. It is the ordinary course with all kinds of costly jobs. A little vote and a low estimate make a beginning; fortifications, docks, and what not, are put in progress; and then, what has been already laid out must not be thrown away, so more goes after it, and Session after Session, in spite of Hume, another lump is voted to be thrown into the hungry swamp. Should this Church extension, with all its promises of selling livings and collecting subscriptions, once commence, we shall soon see the beginning of a series of Parliamentary votes, and we shall never see the end of them. Millions will go after millions. The two aristocratical parties in Parliament are competitors for the favour of the Church. No difficulty will be interposed by them. The Reformers are powerless unless supported from without. And meanwhile the House is pelted with petitions against Papal aggression. It is a lamentable display of utter blindness and stupidity. We are scared by the Pope, and overlook the pickpocket. Even the military farce of a French invasion was not so preposterous as this clerical farce of an Italian invasion. In principle they are the same. The one would have multiplied fortresses, the other would have the land studded with

churches. The one called for regiments of red coats, and the other of black coats. This would have dignified and enriched new colonels and generals, as that would aggrandize new bishops and archdeacons. Each would serve the purposes of a class, draw deeply upon the public resources, and throw back indefinitely all questions of popular rights and progress. Will such gullibility never grow too stale for repetition? The Church should reform itself before it talks of extension. It should purify itself, before it assumes to be identical with the religion of the nation. At present it resembles Noah's ark, in all things save one; it is scarcely in trim to outride a storm or survive a deluge; but it harbours in its bosom all kinds of beasts, clean and unclean, from Popery to Socialism. Who can say what its faith is?—or its worship? Its clergy bandy about charges amongst themselves of fatal heresies and histrionic performances. As to its humility, its charity, and other primeval but obsolete attributes of the Christian religion, why the world is as well able to help the spiritual destitution of the Church as the Church to help the spiritual destitution of the world. Certainly, the piety and morality of the great mass of the people of this country are not at an ebb so low as that they need revival from any corporation which shows itself capable of persecution and plunder, upon the largest scale and the flimsiest pretences. The Protestantism of the people of England can defend itself without episcopal bulwarks. The Pope will never again bestow the British Crown. But are we, therefore, to be taxed for a nest of popelings? The great aggression on property, freedom, and religious equality is at home; not from abroad. Unless the people take early warning, forego all this nonsense about Pio Nono, and put themselves on the alert, they will soon find it so to their cost. They slumber in a nightmare dream of the Papal incubus, and a nearer foe is upon them, with plans for churches and parsons by hundreds, and for taxation to the tune of millions. Will you awake?

PUBLICOLA.

IV.

SCEPTICS' RELIGION.

Under this department, sceptical objections, and systems or principles advocated as hostile to Christianity, are dispassionately considered.

PASSAGES IN THE LIFE OF AN ENQUIRER.

(Continued from page 228.)

CHAP. II.

A JOURNEY—AN INTERRUPTION BY THE READER—ROGER AS CRITIC —POETRY AND PANTHEISM.

And I have felt
A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime,
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean, and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man,
A motion and a spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things.—*Wordsworth.*

THE next morning saw Roger travelling on horseback along the great road, which leads towards Königsberg. The night had carried away the storm across the hills—leading it sobbing off in the distance—as a mother—a riotous child. The sun looked bravely out and cheered the beaten barley, and made canal and river shine out again, along all their winding length, while here and there a roof or spire in Dantzic would glitter as though sheathed in silver. The mist and dewy gossamer that floated above the fields, and the countless drops that lay upon them,—two little worlds of waters above and beneath the narrow firmament of air that stretched between,—were blending into one, and drawing away together into the upper sky. There the vapours were taken up into the clouds and carried in them about the heavens, as in ships, till the time was come for another shower, and then they would disembark, and come down upon upon the earth once more, as rain. This is the life of the wondrous family of rains and snows, of mists and exhalations,—they are the angels of the fields, which lie below, like Jacob in his dream, and watch them ascending and descending by the stairway of the sunshine. The sky-lark rose towards the clouds, and its music streamed down behind it, as the incense from a censer swung high into the air. The fresh odours of the morning, the breeze, the brightness, all united to fill the mind of Roger with that inexpressible exhilaration which the young, the happy, and the healthful feel when they are journeying alone with Nature. The sense of rushing

gladness rendered slow motion-intolerable; he urged his horse to a gallop, and dashed on by wood and field, and farm and farmer's wain, possessed by that hurrying boisterous joy, which is perhaps the more powerful in its impulse, as it has no clearly defined cause or object. Only when he remembered that a day's journey was before him did he slacken his speed into a walk.

Proceeding thus leisurely, he drew three letters out of his pocket; the first, the epistle of last night, from Louise, at Königsberg; the second, one which had arrived enclosed within that, from Dr. Heinrichs, a Professor at the University there, under whose roof Louise was residing; and the third, a scrap from Ahlfeld, thrust into his hand that morning by a servant girl, as he was mounting his horse.

As to the first of these, what is to be done? Is it justifiable to look over his shoulder and make public those words he reads with such delight for the fourth or fifth time already? If so, and that barrier is broken down, another wall of circumvallation stops us—the character of this Periodical. Are these pages—the favourite resort of the intelligent and the thoughtful—to become a receptacle for love-letters?

Reader. "Now you may as well let us have it."

Writer. "My dear Sir, or Madam," as the case may be, "think a moment. This Magazine is a young warrior doing battle in the cause of Logic:—with what consistency, then, could casque and breastplate be put off, and sword and shield laid by—for the silken service of the heart?"

Reader. "But you cannot deny that you are writing a story, and there is a certain faith you are bound to keep with the public. Every one expects to be told something more without loss of time about Louise, and you have not informed us yet of so much as the colour of her eyes and hair."

Writer. "All in good time. Besides I strenuously deny your insinuation—that I am writing a story. How dare you make it? How do you know what injury such an imputation might not inflict on the writer, whoever he, she, or it may be? Perhaps a Reverend, or a very Reverend, or a Professor, or a Divinity student may be on the eve of losing caste for ever should the secret get abroad. A story, indeed! We indignantly repel the charge. This is an *argument*—no story;—an argument with certain characters and incidents which drop in as illustrations,—but true, from first to last, to its expressed purpose of examining and exposing scepticism."

Reader. "Very well. Call it what you like, only get on."

Writer. "You began the interruption, remember."

The second letter was from the Königsberg Professor of Natural History. It ran as follows:—

MY DEAR SIR,

A letter from the seat of the Beast. They pretend to be willing to relinquish all claim. Come over and hold a council of war. That man is a fool, and worse, who goes through life acting on the conviction that his fellow-creatures are scoundrels. He is sure to repine too much—to cut his fingers with his own edge tools, and smart for his bad opinion of humanity. But then, is *one* class of men an exception to this

rule. With them, always understand the opposite intention to the one alleged. Be sure, when they speak peace, they mean war; when they pretend to be resigned, that they are secretly rubbing their hands with glee at having gained their object. I have not alarmed Louise by any hint of the danger that may threaten her.

Yours,

PAUL HEINRICHS.

Roger mused over these words. The more he thought on them, the deeper grew his conviction of their wisdom, and the greater, accordingly, his anxiety. He found some consolation in the thought that three days would bring him to Königsberg, and that he had not to charge himself with any remissness in starting on the summons given.

The third paper from Ahlfeld contained only a single line.—“God must be incomprehensible, not to humiliate, but to establish science.” Here was a text to develop, a suggestion of no little depth to be sounded. It brightened and enlarged before the mind of Roger, as he meditated, into a glorious compass of meaning. “Yes,” he thought—“on this very principle of the identity of knowing and being, if we could comprehend God, and yet were not God, the inconsistency would paralyze philosophy at the outset. To assert the comprehensibility of God, would, in apparently removing one difficulty, make all enquiry besides futile; there would be no principle to develop into law, no basis on which to construct a system. Contradiction in the conditioned is equivalent to impossibility. Contradiction in the absolute is not impossibility, but mystery.

Ahlfeld was very fond of enigmatical oracular utterances, and this sentence, sent to Roger as a continuation of the conversation of the past night, was quite a specimen of his manner in these things. A favourite book with him, was the “symbols” of Pythagoras, and the commentaries of Hierocles on the Golden Verses. There lies a great truth in the sentence, but in his attempt to explain it to himself, Roger was ere long lost again in perplexity. Perhaps allowance should be made for a young metaphysician, in love, and riding through a pleasant country, when so many writers on these subjects, seated at their desks, drawing down their blinds, and retiring into themselves, have written only countless pages of vague and wordy unintelligibility. His thoughts went and came, now diverted by some object as he passed; now with Louise; and, presently again, caught and struggling in some intellectual entanglement.

He felt deeply thankful to a German poet whose lines would haunt and hum about him, circling round and round among his ideas—one of those *refrains* of internal melody that sometimes pursue the mind for two or three days. The verses at any other season he might have overlooked, as containing very little true poetry. But affection had opened his heart to a perception of the poetry of feeling. Before, he had been the exclusive devotee of what may be called the poetry of the fancy. He had sought out everywhere richness of diction and of imagery; but now he was alive to the more insinuating charm of sentiment, gracefully and musically expressed, indebted alone for all its impressiveness to its own simple depth of truth. The song that kept thus rising in his heart and

breaking by snatches from his lips, was one adapted for some fanciful impassioned man, resting by brook or under tree, in the hazy heat of the noontide summer time. "I'll rest me, under the branches here, and hear the birds sing that I love so dearly. How your song goes to my heart, sweet birds;—what know ye of our love, sweet birds, so far off as this? I'll rest me close by the brooklet here, where the spring-flowers breathe that I love so dearly; who could have sent ye here, sweet flowers? Love gifts are ye from her, sweet flowers—so far off as this?"

"Ah," thought Roger, "there speaks the true poet, and I should not have discerned him once. The heart teaches the taste. How true to nature is the feeling that fills the heart of the singer when he utters these words, and it seems to him as though the birds were all singing of his love;—but then reality breaks in for a moment, and he asks, who can have taught them that secret lesson? The flowers so speak to him of her, that they seem to owe their place to her hand, and to breathe as memorials of her who is far away. The inner life of all nature is Love."

A true critique. A prior sense of the delicate beauty of this order of poetry he could not have expressed had he been reviewer-general of bards and martinet of parts to some great critical organ of the day, whose office it is to station the natives of Parnassus, in their order of merit, which is consulted by the public, as the army list by soldiers.

This little song is not yet done with. The imagination, which puts a life for the heart into inanimate, or into animate nature, can also place one there for the understanding. Hence the birth of what is the germ of pantheism in so many minds, in very different lands and times. Tradition need not hand it down. Men do not wait for philosophy to support it by sophistry, or to dignify it by a system. It is an error into which the untutored mind will fall of itself. The first false step is to remove God far away, and to worship certain representatives. The sun and moon, and the host of heaven, are hailed as ambassadors. Soon, to the perverted fancy of the worshippers, the servants are as the master,—the representatives play the god—they are called gods. Deity is attributed to the powers of nature. They are personified. Presidents of processes and of principles, people an imaginary Olympus. The same thought extended, underlay all the visible with a divine life.

The two extremes of ancient philosophy were pantheistic. The first and the last of its endeavours were thus alike. It began with the attempt to refine and elevate the popular superstition,—to rationalize mythology and to moralize legendary marvel. Pythagoras, in the attempt to exhibit fully the infinity of God, failed to give him personality. He was a pantheist. The same attempt with which philosophy set out, was repeated at its close. It started in its youth from the lap of religion—it ran a brave and brilliant career of its own, throughout its manhood,—but its childhood and its old age were similar; it returned to the point from which it set out, and became religious again in its declining years. Then, again, it was pantheistic. Hear Apuleius:—

Jove is the first of all things—Jove the last.
Jove is the head, the midst, all is from Jove.
The base of earth, and starred Olympus he;

Power masculine and maiden evermore,
The soul of all things. Jove is strong-armed fire;
Jove is the ocean's rock; is sun and moon.*

This return of philosophy to a shelter under the sanction of religion was the virtual surrender of its high office. Reason in philosophy must accomplish all, be equal to every occasion, or philosophy gives place to theosophy. When the Neoplatonists said—"we have an inner light, a special revelation," it is quite clear that they had been making assumptions which their logic could not sustain, and which they were fain to authenticate by the claim of inspiration.

Modern pantheism has only improved upon the old in as far as it has borrowed from the Bible. But the lofty morality which pantheists have taken from the gospel, appears in most incongruous contrast with the remainder of their system. As, in some fisher's hut, in the midst of poverty and dirt, the gorgeous silks and rich brocades of some shipwrecked Indian may be seen put to the grotesque uses of ignorance;—so, to employ a similitude of Homeric length,—do the spoils of the gospel morality appear among the dimness and the cobwebs of German speculation. Pantheism lowers man as greatly on the one side, as it professes to exalt him on the other. Its affirmation is—all is God, and God is all. Therefore, man is a part of God. But his individuality is only temporary. In a pantheistic system to be sinful and to be finite, are almost interchangeable terms. The state of separate personality is one of imperfection. Sin with the Hegelian is inadequate development. The development of man's nature, which at the same time is the development of the divine, is the return of the individual into the universal, the absorption of the temporary contraries of present existence in the highest unity of them all. This principle is fatal to any faith in human responsibility. Man may live as he list. The only compensation (as Emerson tries to prove in his Essay on the subject) is the retribution in time. After death the drop is lost in the ocean, and personal existence is no more. Human beings are in the system of the pantheist like the drops thrown up by a fountain, which presently fall into the main body of the water, are lost in it, while at the same time, new ones are being continually thrown out.

Now a learned philosopher, a man of culture, and moral principle, may not come to much harm in practice by the elaboration of principles of this sort. But let them be announced in a popular form—that is, without cautious qualifications and nice distinctions, and the mischief is incalculable. It is in vain for the sage to speak to the crowd, as it were from his parlor window, and to say—"Be moral. Love one another." The morality of the Bible is useless without the facts of the Bible and the sanction of the Bible. What the needy world requires is not merely good advice, but a message and an influence from God, which shall convey the motive and the power elsewhere sought in vain. The mass of those who receive a popularized pantheism as the Bible of the people will embrace it as a

- * *Primus cunctorum est et Jupiter ultimus idem.*
Jupiter et caput, et medium est; sunt ex Jove cuncta;
Jupiter est terrae basis et stellantis Olympi,
Jupiter et mas est ut que idem nympha perennis.
Spiritus est cunctis: vali dusque est Jupiter igris;
Jupiter est pela gi radix: est lunaque solque.—De Mundo.

licence for every passion, since it is the removal of every fear. The moral ideal that may attract the eye of the erudite philosopher has never been seen by the untaught to whom his system may be presented. If a fatalistic law of influx and of efflux, a denial of his future personal immortality, combine to tell such a man that his life here is necessitarian and ephemeral, the last hold of even men morality is swept away. To take the Bible from the rich is to do a work worthy of the powers of darkness. To take the Bible from the poor is to do a work worthy of thrones and dominions among those powers.

CHAP. III.

POETRY—FRIENDSHIP—AN EXAMPLE OF ALLEGORICAL INTERPRETATION—A DREAM.

And this undetermined roving,
Brings delight and brings good heed,
And thy striving be it with loving,
And thy living be it indeed.—*Goethe's Wilhelm Meister.*

OLAUS MAGNUS says that there is a mountain in the bleak regions of the north, on the top of which is perpetual summer. There by pleasant streams, branches laden with fruit wave in the air, and the whole realm of charmed enclosure is lovely and vocal with the sights and sounds of the blessed. But to scarcely any is the locality of the mountain known. From young men it is to be concealed, lest they should hasten after this place of joy and rest, abandoning the rough discipline and toil of life. Such an elevation, and so peopled with the delights of enchantment, is poetry. Such also, according to some, should be the caution with which young men should be counselled, lest reverie should have more charms for them than action, and they should grow up dreamers rather than workers. They should rather, it is thought, be repelled than encouraged, if the stirrings of desire become apparent within them after this abode of the ideal.

But the apprehension rests on a misconception of the true character of poetry. It is feared as a something likely to fill the mind with disgust at the every-day duties of life. But only to those who are its half-taught devotees can this danger be a real one. A character naturally indolent, with a strong propensity for castle-building, is, it must be confessed, placed in some such peril by a course of poetical reading. And what is there which has not its danger to a weak and effeminate temperament? In cases, however, where there is any vigour of character, any warmth of heart worth the culture, we say, drink deep—poetry will strengthen and ennoble you, it can never harm.

To call an idle yearning after some sunnier land, some easier life, some larger range of influence and opportunity, the thirst after ideal beauty which makes the love of poetry, is an abuse of terms. He has the true

soul for thought of this order, who has not to be dependant on mountains and lakes, on the grandeur or the winsomeness of natural scenery, for poetic feeling; but who, though he never writes a line, can yet carry his poetry within him, a heart-well everywhere—in the midst of the smoke and stir of the city, among the throng of his fellows, or into some homely or poverty-stricken room. To be able to clothe even daily toil with the rainbow hues of imagination, to see more poetry in every-day people than they were ever conscious was in themselves, to be able to discern that inner life of things, a dead letter to so many; this is the office of the poetical nature. Such an eye for the existence within and about him, had Roger. He knew that it was not his mission to sing—but that never troubled him, his own inward world was rich enough. This was no merely selfish enjoyment. It sprang from sympathy, it enlarged sympathy. He could never have possessed this gift of poetry unexpressed, had not his heart been warm and kindly. His heart again would have been less full of love had he quenched rather than fanned his kindled phantasy.

Roger thought poets were like those peasants of the Alps who are let down by ropes, at peril of their lives, to mow the little ledges of meadow that lie among the precipices, smiling in the heart of horror,—and to roll down the hay in huge bundles to those below. He thought the art, like that of the samphire gatherers, hanging in the air, a “dreadful trade.” These sunny spots of beauty, from which the poet enriches mankind in the valley, are neighboured by the fantastic peaks and dolorous gulfs of madness. Sometimes they lie in serene light, while storm and cloud darken the lowlands; but oftener they are swept by fierce winds, and there are dark and evil shapes clinging about the crags that shut them in. So Roger was thankful, not discontented, that his lot was to be cast among the forgotten recipients, and was not fixed with the exalted benefactors. He could read and remember and bless these almoners of beauty. Memory was a wind that carried down to him continually, as he watched below, wild-flowers, severed from their stems, by the shining ones labouring above.

Towards night-fall Roger approached a small town, on entering which, he made his way to an inn he had known on the same journey formerly. He found the large room filling fast, for it was near supper-time. About one table was gathering a little knot of young men, officers in the army. About another sat some of the substantial tradesmen and burghers of the town. Roger felt little inclination to join either party—indeed the military men would not have admitted him if he had. Roger could not avoid a slight feeling of contempt as he looked at the young idlers and heard their jests and laughter. He remembered what he had read of the Prussian army before the wars of Napoleon, how inefficient and how insolent it was, and how the Corsican presently laid their overweening confidence in the dust. So might it fare he thought with some of those striplings if opposed by a formidable adversary. But he checked the feeling when he called to mind that among them, perhaps, might be a man or two destined to enlighten and delight the country by his books. For in Prussia, every one, lawyer, doctor, or apprentice, must be soldier at same time. In a corner of the room sat at a smaller table a young

man alone, and Roger went up and took his place near him. The stranger he approached was evidently a student;—on his way perhaps, thought Roger, to Königsberg. The light curling hair flowing down upon his shoulders,—the carefully cultured moustache—the costume, not adapted to any arbitrary standard imposed by fashion, but original and picturesque, apparently designed to display the wearers own ideas of what was becoming,—all pointed him out at once to the quick eye of Roger as a youth enjoying to the full that happy careless time which is the holiday of German life, between the bondage of the gymnasium in boyhood, and the toil, the prose and the Philistinism, of maturer years. He was bending over a book, apparently abstracted from all that was passing around, but on observing Roger seat himself at the table, he laid a fork in the place, put the book on one side, and entered into conversation with him. They chatted about the neighbourhood, the lakes, the woods; about Königsberg, its great names, and its character and prospects as a University. They agreed to sup together. A small sharp boy with hair cut very short, so as to give his head the appearance of being covered with mouseskin, brought them the Braten, Compot, &c., essential to a goodly German supper, and set the Johannisberger on the table. The fork had to be taken out from between the leaves.

"A beautiful example that," said Von Arnim (for so the student was named)—"of the union of the ideal and the real, of the poetical and the actual—this homely practical prong keeping my place among the stanzas of the poet."

Roger smiled, and answered, "Aye—life's problem typically achieved on a supper table. But, seriously, a poet must employ the practical to know where he is, and if he would not lose his place must use some implement of daily life among his fancies. But what is the book, may I ask?"

"Uhland's Poems."

"Allow me," said Roger, stretching out his hand towards the precious volume.

"Nay," interposed the student, "now let us attend to the claims of the actual, viz.,—eating. One thing at a time. We can order up the Ambrosia for dessert if you will."

Supper over,—and having sung out the departing meal right merrily with the gentle clashing of their glasses, as they drank each others health, Teuton-wise,—the new acquaintances returned with one consent to Uhland.

"Here," said Arnim "is the piece I was reading, sending down my line some little way into its depth of meaning. This suggestive poetry I admire bove all."

They read the poem together. It was called *The King's Son*. It began by saying how the grey old king sat on the throne of his fathers; his mantle glorious as the red of an evening sky, and his crown shining like the setting sun. He divides his kingdom between his first and second sons, and asks his third and favourite one what he shall leave him? The youth asks for the old crown and three ships, and says he will find himself a throne. He stands on the deck as his ship rides off into the sea, and cries proudly—that ocean is my kingdom! But a storm rises,

the ship goes down, and the youthful monarch of the deep, in fancy, is overwhelmed, with all his glory.

"What do you make of that?" asked Arnim, of Roger, when they had proceeded so far.

"There is the first ambition and the first disappointment," answered he. "Youth, with its self-confidence, believes a whole world of possible creations already its own,—but the first launching out beyond conception into execution, is a discovery of the true difficulty,—so disheartening a one, that he who was so self-confident a short while since, is, in a moment, buried in self-discontent and hopelessness.

"What," cried Arnim, "and you an Englishman, one of those cold matter-of-fact islanders. I had not thought it possible that the airy beauty of our German poesy could have been so revealed to any one of you. Your hand! You are a brother. The great spirits of our fatherland have initiated you into the mystic secrets of that land of fable, which holds the hidden love of life."

Roger looked a moment surprised at this outburst of German enthusiasm, but his nature was too genial and impulsive, to allow him to hesitate in returning with equal cordiality, the grasp of hearty friendship. He was one of those persons who are always resolving to be very cautious, properly reserved, and hard-hearted, but who, some how or other, never can succeed.

But to go on with the ballad. A fisherman sees the young hero, swimming manfully to shore with the golden crown upon his head. The prince comes safely to land, and tells the fisherman that he is a king's son, but homeless now. He has had, he says, two mothers, a tender earthly one that bare him; but now a second, the strong sea that has cradled in her giant arms, himself and all his brothers. But he alone has survived this rugged nursing, and now his mother ocean has shown him the strand on which he has been thrown, as his kingdom hereafter. He fishes with the fisherman, but catches no fish, and answers the old man, by saying that he is watching palaces under the sea, and royal glories, too deep down for any angler's line.

"Here," said the student, "the strong mind rises above discomfiture. The man who cannot recover himself after failure, will accomplish nothing. After having disappointed himself—the heaviest cross of all, he yet holds his hope of a kingdom somewhere."

"Yes," added Roger, "and makes his very troubles minister to his hopes,—sees kingly towers in the heart of the very waves that wrecked him. This is the wisdom of the wise—to see in their very suffering the assurance that they have not lived in vain, and to gather their rose of hope, as it were off the very breast of that frost-breathing son of winter,—hardship."

"Well done," said Arnim.

The young hero slays the lion, and clothes himself in the royal hide, brings down the eagle with his shaft, leaps on the wild horse, and tames him to his will,—comes thundering down one day—his lion skin about his shoulders, the mane of the wild steed flying, and his hoofs dashing fire—a sudden apparition—among the people of the valley. They shout, "it is the king, the king we have so long awaited!"

"That is a lesson for the workers," said Roger. "He dares, he toils, he shows himself right royal in what he has done. He does not urge the claim of his descent and try to win the suffrages of the people so. He deserves to reign, and he is acknowledged king. Let us toil on. Let us lay the foundation of thought and study deep, or our structure will never abide. We must manfully encounter, alone and unseen, the lions in the way, and so approve ourselves the men for leadership, should occasion call us to it."

"You speak almost as though you meant to become author or statesman, some day. Do you write?"

"Not I," answered Roger, "but I endeavour to cultivate what powers I have to the utmost, so that I may not be useless in that little circle where I may make my influence felt. Every man must work out himself by himself. Great models, and the record of great actions, must be rather guides than stimulants. I would learn from every man, but woe be to me if I endeavour to mould myself after any other man's fashion. Our work must be done from the heart, our own ideal and our own experience must elaborate the mass of material we have acquired, and the stamp of ourselves, the *impriniatu* of our *Ne (Ich)* must be visible on all we do. Success consists—"

"Stop," interrupted Arnim, "is not that worship of success, as it is called, the great bane of all effort as it is commonly undertaken?"

"It is. But I mean by the successful man, one who can say that he has succeeded to a large extent in doing justice to the abilities God has given him. What people say ;—frustration or glory,—pomp or persecution, enter not at all into the question."

"I like that principle" answered Arnim. "I would agree with you in saying that our business here is self-development in the name of God on behalf of man. I think the transition admirably indicated in the ballad from aspiration to action. His former proud and restless anticipations are abandoned. He gives up dreaming. The mind, which we are imagining as the antitype to the hero of the poem, learns quiet confidence after all its former tumult. Such a man labours on steadily, quite sure that he has power in him of some sort and indomitable perseverance, and that with these, he will, without fail, effect a *something*. He does not measure himself by others. He rejoices in their success. There is corn enough for all. His aim is to realize the possibilities of his own being. Then he will take his place, sooner or later, as one of the appointed links in the great chain of beneficial influence. To wish to be remembered, is folly. But this every man should covet, to be at least a grain in the scale of the good against the evil of his generation."

"I was going to say," continued Roger, "that the secret of success lies in doing well, everything you have in hand—in working and in waiting. If the world wants you, let it come for you. Be sure it will turn a deaf ear to all your calling, if you impatiently insist on its looking at you before you are qualified to be of service. A man should be found, like Saul, "among the stuff."

In the end of the Poem, the prince disenchant a princess, who has been long the terror of the land, in the shape of a fire-breathing dragon. She rises from her hideous shape, the fairest maiden in all the world, be-

comes his queen, and out of the ruins of the cavern, which was her haunt, springs a palace, where, surrounded by gallant knights, the young king sees his dreams all fulfilled.

"That too," said Arnim, "is well imagined. Do not our difficulties, bravely assailed, transform themselves into delight, and do we not inhabit the memory of the obstacles we have overcome, as a golden house,—yea more, armed men spring out of them, stalwart powers of mind, multiplied by our struggles, that ring us round with defence. The adverse circumstances of life, once vanquished, become our vassals ever after."

"Good," exclaimed Roger, more and more charmed with his new friend.

"You must have seen or suffered much to be able to speak thus from experience. You are younger than I am."

"I have imagined much," answered Arnim, "suffered little, and seen less. But we fanciful susceptible people live a great deal of life through in a short time. I have passed through the transition state you described just now already, and I have life before me for well-directed labour. I have found that imagination has enriched me with some of the first fruits of experience—for by that faculty I have lived in many minds of whom I have read, have become them for a time in their heroism, their passion, their calamities. Were I ever to write a tragedy, I should find this serviceable—but I lack the other elements for success in that career."

"May we neither of us ever know the misery of devoting ourselves to a vocation to which we are unequal?"

"Amen," answered Arnim, with deep seriousness. The friends parted to retire to rest, having agreed to continue their journey in company early the next morning. Roger's sleep was troubled by dreams. He thought that he was going into a cave, where Louise had been transformed into a dragon, that he might unloose the spell, but the sides of the cavern moved and strained, with strange whispers, nearer to each other; the fire from the dragon's mouth grew fainter, the pressure seemed to crush the hideous shape and the rescuer together:—then came a change—he thought she had been restored to her old form, and they were in a galley on the sea, but enchanters in the shape of huge dolphins followed in their wake, and raised a storm, and he stood in the stern throwing spears at them, which continually glided off, till at last he wounded one, when the waves stilled—the sea grew darker and darker, till its colour was wholly changed, it was everywhere blood-red, and every wave was a face, swimming in that crimson ocean; the crest of each surge a pallid visage expression of the deepest woe:—then they sank, and the beauty of nature returned once more, and the vessel seemed to be nearing a tropical island which the sunny sea threw its arms about, and seemed to love, as some great mind a fair purpose:—there they landed, and went under the roof of leaves and hanging fringe of flower-bells, and over the floor, where there was a mosaic of blossoms for pavement, and beside a bubbling spring, the wayward lover of the leaves, for which the plants that grew along the ground endeavoured to make a network with their twining arms, but the stream glided under or shot its silver threads through them, and escaped, leaping into the sea. Here as he turned to speak again to Louise, she had vanished and he awoke.

The remainder of the journey to Königsberg was agreeable to the travellers, but present nothing specially worthy of record. On entering that city, however, they met with an adventure which will give the reader much important information concerning personages as yet but imperfectly known.

(*To be continued.*)

GO WHEN THE MORNING SHINETH.

Written by Mrs. Follen.

Go when the morning shineth,
Go when the noon is bright
Go when the day declineth,
Go in the hush of night.
Go with pure mind and feeling,
Cast earthly thoughts away,
And in thy chamber kneeling,
Do thou in secret pray.

Remember all who love thee,
All who are lov'd by thee ;
Pray, too, for those who hate thee,
If any such there be :
Then for thyself in meekness,
A blessing humbly claim,
And link with each petition
The great Redeemer's name.

Or if, 'tis e'er denied thee
In solitude to pray,
Should holy thoughts come o'er thee,
When friends are round thy way,
E'en then the silent breathing,
Thy spirit rais'd above,
Will reach his throne of glory,
Who reigns the God of Love.

Oh not a joy nor blessing
With this can we compare,
The power that he hath given us
To pour our souls in prayer.
Whene'er thou pin'st in sadness,
Before his footstool fall,
Remember in thy gladness,
His love who gave thee all.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN NATURE.

The Nature of Man as Spiritual, Immortal, and Responsible, will be the most frequent topic of this department: though sometimes we shall introduce MISCELLANEOUS Subjects.

MIND AND MATTER: THEIR EVIDENCES AND DISTINCTIONS.

(Continued from page 96.)

BISHOP BUTLER argued that since consciousness is indivisible "it should seem that the subject in which it resides must be so too:" "since it is a contradiction to suppose one part of consciousness here and another there, the perceptive power is indivisible too, and consequently the subject in which it resides, *i. e.* the conscious being." He further observes, what has since been acknowledged by the best physiologists, "we have already several times over lost a great part, or perhaps the whole of our bodies, according to certain common established laws of nature, yet we remain the same living agents." Whence it plainly follows, first, from the nature of the thinking principle, that it cannot be matter; and secondly, from the constant change in every part of our living frame, if our bodies were in any respects like our minds, we should not be the same individuals two days together;—which belies our strongest convictions.

The question whether brain can be the organ of thought, in any intelligible sense, as carrying on the thinking process, though nearly allied to the present, is a subject for a separate enquiry: it may be sufficient here to observe, that since there is so great a difference between the qualities of mind and body, it is a contradiction to suppose that the operations of mind are a physical process carried on by a material agent: or that the *brain thinks any more than the eye or a telescope sees.*

Matter, we have seen by its various combinations, can produce only material results, of the same nature as belong to the parts in any compound or arrangement:—figure, magnitude, and motion: it is a thing that can be divided, whilst none of the mental processes can, we cannot have half a thought, or quarter of a sensation; or a red emotion; or a square affection: we can neither weigh nor measure our principles: they are therefore questions of a different order,—affections of a different nature or substance, to those outward things we call matter—the inert and unintelligent mass, the bricks and mortar of the fabric called nature.

Now the mind if immaterial, is immortal: because being immaterial, simple and not compounded, it is not subject to the destruction which

results from decay, decomposition, or separation of its component parts. We have no instances of annihilation; for all changes destroy no parts, but only separate them: a house when burnt down, is *destroyed only as a house*, not as so many existing things: the structure is gone into fragments: but the soul having no parts, cannot be divided into fragments, and therefore will for ever *exist as a soul*. And that the mind is immaterial (and so immortal) is evident from the fact that no combinations can produce thought, from any known qualities of matter: and also because all the qualities of mind, are of another order, to those which by the senses we perceive in outward objects: *as is evident from this, that we cannot perceive mind or any of its qualities, by the senses*. That therefore which is not an object of sense, is of a different kind, from what is an object of sense: in other words, it is not a sensible or material thing.

Further, the mind is not to be regarded as related to space: since none of its qualities have extension: its thoughts and feelings are not so many miles long or broad: therefore it is not extended; but matter is; and consequently it is not matter.

But it *has relation to time*, or duration; for its states may abide so long, it may have pain or pleasure by the hour, though not by the yard: it endures, but does not extend: it lasts or exists in time, but does not stretch, or exist in so much room or space. Mind, therefore, which actually abides during life, after the constant flux and departure of all the elements of the body, and which is not material in its nature, is not subject to decay in death, since the laws of separation or dissolution belong only to material things.

This conclusion we can state in the words of Bishop Berkeley:—"We have shewn" says that author, "that the soul is indivisible, incorporeal, unextended, and is consequently incorruptible. Nothing can be plainer, than that the motions, changes, decays, and dissolutions which we hourly see befall natural bodies, (and which is what we mean by *the course of nature*) cannot possibly affect an active simple, uncompounded substance: such a being therefore, is indissoluble by the force of nature, that is to say, *the soul of man is naturally immortal*."

The absurdity of the contrary conclusion, may be understood, by a passage from Howe's "Living Temple;" in which he shews the folly of the epicurean philosophy.—"Only consider what is said of the constitution and nature of the human soul; which is said to be composed of very well polished, the smoothest and roundest atoms; and which are of the neatest fashion; every way you must suppose the best conditioned the whole country could afford. . . . And these are the things you must know, which think, study, contemplate, frame syllogisms, make theorems, lay plots, contrive business, act the philosopher, the logician, the mathematician and everything else. . . . The least atoms are fittest for this turn:—but sure, if all sober reason be not utterly lost and squandered away among these little entities, it must needs be judged altogether incomprehensible why,—*if upon account of littleness* any atom should be capable of reasoning—all should not be so, and then we could not but have a very rational world."

And what is here said by Howe respecting the atoms composing the world, may also be said of the minds too generally helping to compose

society, that if littleness is the qualification for reason; we have room for very general congratulation: though none shall be so highly congratulated, as those "minute philosophers" who construct mind out of matter.

II. We may secondly consider the theory of idealism, as maintained by Bishop Berkeley, in his "Principles of Human Knowledge," and in three Dialogues on this subject between Hylas and Philonous: from which we shall learn at least, what is to be thought of the boasted certainty about matter, and how much we know of the real nature of that substance. Whence it will be seen, that to say that mind is matter, is to say that it is something of which we know nothing.

Nor let any one imagine, that what Berkeley says is a mere fallacy, which every child can detect, for he has never been answered except by urging objections which he himself clearly foresaw and refuted. And here let us advise all who can get Berkeley, to read him, especially his "Minute Philosopher," which though of a metaphysical nature, is full of immitable beauty and simplicity: and is as pleasing in style, as it is instructive in the subjects discussed.

In his "Principles of Human Knowledge," and his Dialogues upon them with which we have now to do, his main object is to shew, that the wonderful thing called matter, the substratum or supporter of those qualities we perceive by our senses; is a thing of which we have no experience nor knowledge, and that all we are acquainted with, is certain effects in our own minds, called sensible ideas: which may result from no material or external objects; but may be produced in our thoughts, by the regular method of working carried on by an omnipotent Spirit. Now whatever may be thought as to what causes the impressions upon our senses; whether it be matter or a spirit, it is certain that we can know no more respecting it, than what we experience; that is, our sensations, or the ideas existing in our minds.

"That neither our thoughts nor passions, nor ideas formed by the imagination, exist without the mind," he observes, "is what everybody will allow. And it seems no less evident, that the various sensations or ideas imprinted on the sense,—cannot exist otherwise than in a mind perceiving them." "Light and colours, heat and cold, extension and figures, in a word, the things we see and feel, what are they but so many sensations, notions, ideas, or impressions on the sense? and is impossible to separate even in thought, any of these from perception." And obviously so, for they are *perceptions*, as every one who has considered them allows.

"Whence it follows," says the author, "that there is no other substance but spirit, or that which perceives."

"Some make a distinction, between primary and secondary qualities: by the former, they mean extension, figure, motion, rest, solidity, or impenetrability and number: by the latter, they denote all other sensible qualities as colours, sounds, tastes, and so forth. Secondary qualities, they acknowledge exist only in the mind, but that our ideas of primary qualities are patterns or images of things existing without the mind, in an unthinking substance called *matter*. But as extension, figure and motion, are only ideas in the mind, and an idea can be like nothing but another idea, consequently, neither they nor their archetypes can exist in

an unthinking substance. Hence, it is plain, that the very notion of what is called matter or corporeal substance, involves a contradiction in it." And, whereas colour is allowed to exist only in the mind, but cannot be conceived of apart from extension, it would seem that extension also is an idea in the mind. Great and small are evidently comparative ideas, and depend not upon outward things, but upon the strength of our organs; for what is small to a man, is large to a mite: and what is small to the naked eye, is large to the view by the microscope: what is *one* to the naked eye, is *many* when more closely examined; indeed, number is plainly an idea, as one man or one regiment, in which the unity is a mental assemblage, and not a real thing.

"I do not argue," says Berkeley, "against any one thing that we can apprehend, either by sense or by reflection. That the things I see with my eyes, and touch with my hands, do really exist, I make no question. The only thing whose existence we deny, is that which philosophers call matter, or corporeal substance:"—"the matter philosophers contend for, is an *incomprehensible something which hath none of those particular qualities, whereby the bodies falling under our senses, are distinguished one from another.*" This is perhaps the happiest expression Berkeley has given of his views, and demonstrates that at least men know nothing of matter; but it is something which they suppose to exist under, and support what they see and feel. And which therefore has ever been hidden from their observation.

"For instance," observes this philosopher, "in this proposition a die is hard, extended and square; they will have it that the word *die* denotes a subject or substance, distinct from the hardness, extension, and figure, which are predicated of it, and in which they exist. This I cannot comprehend: to me, a die seems to be nothing distinct from those things which are termed its *modes or accidents*. To say a die is hard, extended, and square, is not to attribute those qualities to a subject distinct from, and supporting them: but only an explication of the meaning of the word die." This may still further be seen, for, take away the hardness, squareness, and extension, and where is your die?—it has no existence; neither has that matter or substratum of which persons speak with a confidence becoming their ignorance. As for hardness or solidity, that is plainly a sensation, or feeling of resistance; and hard or soft, is relative according to our susceptibility; whilst it is in every case a greater or less feeling of a certain kind, in our spirits; and this is all we know of the three states of matter, solid, liquid, and gas: three degrees of pressure; or, if you please, *the three degrees of comparison in our sensations.*

REVIEWS AND CRITICISMS.

Tracts of the British Anti-State-Church Association. No. 8. The Trusteeship of the State Church. An Enquiry into the Management of the Episcopal and Capitular Estates.

Every one ought to possess and carefully examine this calm, clear, and judicial exposure of the unjust stewards. It should make Churchmen blush, and the nation indignant. One sentence may suffice as a sample, since the whole may be had for two-pence.

"Entrusted with public property, worth from £45,000,000 to £50,000,000 sterling, the dignitaries are defaulters to the amount of from £25,000,000 to £30,000,000—being able to pay on that part of the property which they have leased, only 4s. 11½d. in the pound." Are not these "robbers of the churches?"

Tracts of the British Anti-State-Church Association, 4, Crescent, Bridge Street, Blackfriars. Our State Church. I. In England. II. In Ireland. III. In Scotland. IV. In Wales.

This shillings-worth is worth a shilling: it places us in possession of a clear account, (in four Tracts, bound together,) of the revenues and general condition of our State Churches. We should rejoice to see it become the handbook for the million.

The security of the Church, as a political institution, rests on the sand of the nations ignorance: its renovation and efficiency can be obtained only resting it on the true basis of voluntary support and popular control.

The spiked Cannons.—

This is another of the new series issued by the Anti-State-Church Association, it contains a useful condensed account of the different persecuting Church Laws, which have been annulled by the advance of the age. It is calculated to make Dissenters in these days, grateful to Providence; whilst it should make the Church more modest than to cast stones at her persecuting mother.

Lectures to Young Men on Various important Subjects. By the Rev. HENRY WARD BEECHER, America. With an introduction by Rev. O. T. DOBBIN, LL.D. London: Ward and Co.

This is the work of a young American Minister, and such has been its popularity in America, that sixteen thousand copies have been issued from the press in that country. And truly is the success deserved. Seldom have we read "Lectures to Young Men" so eminently adapted to gain their end.

The writer is a strong-minded earnest man, one fully alive to most of the dangers which beset the path in which the man of business walks, and one gifted above most with the powers of giving utterance to his faithful warnings. The Lectures are seven in number.

1. Industry and Idleness. 2. Twelve causes of Dishonesty. 3. Six Warnings. 4. Portrait Gallery, in which are drawn to the very life, the Wit, the Humorist, the Cynic, the Libertine, the Demagogue, and the Party Man. 5. Gambler's and Gambling. 6. The Strange Woman. 7. Popular Amusements.

Some of the characters herein sketched, are no doubt thoroughly American, and are not often found on English soil, but the book is written by too close an observer of human nature not to be suited to the young men of England. The matter of the Lectures is emphatically good, and nothing is lost by the style in which it is expressed.

The writer's language is clear, vigorous, and beautiful, and his sketches of character are wonderfully graphic. There is something in the style and freshness of the thoughts

which makes the work totally unlike anything of the kind we ever read. We can most cordially commend it to the serious perusal of our young men, and could heartily wish that parents would place it in the hands of their sons. With regard to those who have young men in their employ, we have not the slightest doubt but that it would be much even to their worldly advantage, were they to present each one with a copy of this cheap, well-got up, and valuable work.

The "Introduction," by the Rev. T. O. Dobbin, LL.D., is a sufficient pledge of the value of the work.

Christianity and its Evidences. By the Rev. J. G. ROGERS, B.A. London: B. L. Green. Newcastle-on-Tyne: T. B. Barkas.

Mr. Rogers has done a good work, in thus embodying the results of considerable reading and thought in this able and useful production. The author has fairly appreciated the strength and the weakness of the various forms of infidelity, advocated by certain writers and lecturers. The "Evidences" here argued, are not such as relate merely to historical questions; but include a much wider range, and more adapted to the difficulties which are in these days felt and urged by some respecting Christianity.

The extent of subjects examined may be sufficiently understood by the table of contents, which constituted the topics of separate Lectures, delivered by the author, and here presented to the reading public.

"Lecture 1. The Ideal of Christianity. 2 The Oracles of Christianity—a Discourse on the Bible. 3. The Antecedents of Christianity:—the Old Testament. 4. The Records of Christianity:—the Gospels. 5. The Founder of Christianity;—the Life of Christ critically examined. 6. The Antagonists of Christianity."

We cordially recommend this work to enquiring young men.

The Last Trial by Jury for Atheism, in England. By GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE. London: James Watson.

We have read this book with feelings of painful interest: first, because of the unchristian method of punishing infidelity by law; secondly, because of the harsh and unchristian severity added to the law by officials; thirdly, because of the strange perversion of reason in the author of the book, (and the object of this persecution,) in deliberately charging all this upon Christianity.

Mr. Holyoake should know better than this; and whether he believe or reject the gospel, should at least do it justice.

We know it is a natural transference of feeling, to hate Christianity for what is done in its name: but though natural, it is neither logical nor just.

We shall however reserve these questions for a more extended examination: when we shall notice at length, the facts and arguments contained in this work, together with the lessons it conveys.

Meanwhile, we observe to Mr. Holyoake and his friends, that we should esteem it a favour if they would give us any proofs out of the Gospels or Epistles, that legal vengeance is a Christian method of defending Christianity: whilst we further congratulate the enforcers of law on their success in deepening men's hatred of the Gospel, by their own disgraceful violation of its spirit. They are the true Infidels, who, abandoning reliance on God's own truth, bring in policemen and gaolers to defend the ark.

An Essay on the Duty of Sabbath School Teachers, in preparing for their Class. Read before the Conference of Sabbath School Teachers, for Birmingham and the Midland Counties, April 1851. By JAMES LEWITT. Coventry: E. Gooda. Leicester: J. F. Winks. Birmingham: J. Showell.

This useful practical address, deserves extensive circulation amongst Sabbath School Teachers. It is a forcible statement of an important and perhaps too-much neglected duty.

ERRATUM in our last, page 198, fourth paragraph, read—"the same mistake is made by a writer of another cast, who in opposing "the letter," and depreciating the word, seem to have read to little purpose."

I.

CHRIST'S RELIGION.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD." 1 Thess. v. 21.

THE BASIS OF HUMAN BROTHERHOOD; IN THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF "ONE GOD AND FATHER OF ALL."

THE terms "LIBERTY, FRATERNITY, EQUALITY," sacred symbols of great and beneficial principles, have been desecrated by the foul touch of Atheism, superstition, spoliation, and bloodshed: until the words as thus associated together, have become the symbol of irreligion, rapine, and murder: and the principles for which they stand, have become the objects of odium and calumny, enabling the lovers of despotism by a deceivableness worthy of their cause, to cry out against all freedom—in the name of God and his religion!

Thus do infidelity and licentiousness play into the hands of civil and spiritual tyranny, as they desecrate the *name* of freedom, till priests and despots may with a convenient cloak, insult our common Father, by employing his name to put down and retard, if not extinguish its *reality*.

This love of misrepresentation, this unwillingness to learn the truth, by which men shut their own eyes or those of others to the reality which may easily be known, is the ancient and natural defence of the supporters of existing evils. Thus our blessed Lord himself was charged with destroying the temple; and with blasphemy against his Father, whose will he accomplished: his first martyr was declared to have uttered "blasphemous words against Moses and against God;" his followers were long stigmatized as Atheists; thus was their name first altered and then cast out as evil. The most difficult thing in the world, is to get men to understand the real character of that which they oppose. *To awake righteousness*—honestly to employ their faculties in discerning the truth which is presented to them.

Hence words of truth, become watchwords of hatred, and marks of calumny. So "liberty, fraternity, equality," are brought into disrepute—crucified between two thieves—by the conduct of those who have pretended to them, and the cunning of those who are hostile. In the mouths of some, it meant liberty from God; fraternity in robbery and bloodshed; equality in degradation.

And because these have debased the name, others have taken occasion to slander the reality, and reproach all who love it. The advocates of fraternity, are aspersed with the horrors of the French Revolution: they are accused of infidelity, and thus religion is slandered, as if freedom and infidelity belonged together.

Nor are the opponents of Christianity slow to take advantage of this aspersion on the gospel; as they seek to found the rights of man, on a denial of the word of God, in which human rights and duties are enforced by the highest obligations.

It is therefore necessary not so much to vindicate, as to explain, the Scriptures, for they will vindicate themselves to those who understand the nature of their truths, and the extent of their beneficial application.

And when all men know "the mystery, of God even the Father, and of Christ," his representative or personal manifestation, they will discover that the truest sanctuary of freedom, is "the shadow of his wings;" the protection of "*one God and Father of all.*"

This doctrine of one God, is the fundamental truth of the Bible, on which all other truths rest, or to which everything else in the Scriptures, is intimately related.

And the existence of this truth in that word, is a manifest proof of its inspiration; for all other books or religions which recognize this doctrine, have obtained it from the Scriptures. The Deist is indebted to the Bible for his opinions.

Deism is not to be discovered from nature, by man's unaided reason: because there have been no Deists, where there has been no revelation. The doctrine of one God, of only one God, was held by the Patriarchs and the Jews; but not by the Egyptians, Persians, Greeks, or Romans. Yet all these nations were superior in civilization and philosophy to the Jews.

Mohammed's Deism was borrowed: so is that of all sceptics in a Christian country.

Nature will help to confirm the idea of God; but has never yet imparted it to any: or, if so, to what people?

The first verse in the Bible contains more wisdom than all the philosophy of Greece. Yet the Hebrews were not naturally wiser than the Grecians; *WHENCE then, had they that wisdom?*

If it cannot be accounted for naturally, it must be accounted for supernaturally. Some indeed assume that what is supernatural, is incapable of proof: but here is a dilemma for all such reasoners:—no other nation (indeed no individual) ever attained to the knowledge of one God; therefore such attainment is itself supernatural, being out of the ordinary course. But it is not reasonable to rest in this conclusion, that a strange anomaly has occurred,—that weakness has done more than strength could effect; and therefore we are in reason bound to adopt the other hypothesis, which, though equally supernatural, is not equally anomalous; since it introduces a sufficient cause, namely, God himself, making known what none have found out.

We are shut up then to a miraculous contradiction, that the Patriarchs and Jews discovered what has baffled the wisest nations in their maturity; or else to a consistent miracle that the weaker have received help; and that what was hidden from the wise and prudent, was revealed unto babes.

Greece in the height of its wisdom, maintained in Athens (the centre of natural enlightenment) an altar, with this inscription, "To THE UNKNOWN GOD;" the God whom we cannot discover: the Bible began

with "the God that made the worlds:" and Greece had to be taught this lesson, after all her philosophical enquiries. Thus is vindicated that saying of Paul, (1 Cor. i. 21, 31.)—"For after that in the wise arrangement of God, the world was left to discover that by its own wisdom, it could not find out God; it pleased the Divine Being to reveal himself, that according as it is written, he that glorieth, should glory in the Lord."

Let us not be mistaken, as if asserting that the existence of God is now an uncertainty: it can be *proved*, after being stated; but not *discovered* originally from nature.

Many men can demonstrate a problem in Euclid, which they could not originate. This truth then is immovable, though not discoverable: we feel its force when declared; and it throws a new light on the wonders and harmonies of the universe, from which it receives in return the fullest confirmation.

The declaration of this truth is in the Bible; the support of it is in nature: but none have ever found it there: so that the Jews were either miraculous in themselves, or a miracle supplied them with this important doctrine.

This argument has been well expressed in the following terms:—"to ask me to believe that the knowledge of *one living and true God*, could be obtained from the book of nature, without the aid of revealed religion, would be calling on me to credit a fact on the same ground on which they (Sceptics) profess to deny all revelation and miracles: viz. a fact that is *contrary to all history, experience, or evidence*.*"

This one truth therefore, is the great miracle of the Bible; the sun which reveals and regulates everything else. This doctrine of one God, never has been discovered, by any people; it may be *confirmed* by reasonings respecting outward nature; but never can be discovered from that source. What Hume says of barbarous nations, is equally true of civilized ones, as history proves.—"Though the stupidity of men, barbarous and uninstructed, be so great, that they may not see a sovereign author in the more obvious works of nature, to which they are much familiarized, yet, it seems scarcely possible that any one of good understanding should *reject that idea*, when once it is suggested to him."†

This, as we have shewn, can be *adopted* by men, but not originated by their researches.

The truth thus brought to our knowledge, is capable of manifold applications; indeed this is the excellency of those spiritual revelations contained in the Scriptures, that they are of great practical value, having an influence on all the relations of human life. Heathen religions admitted many gods; all independent of each other; and thus cherished the motley mixture of detached superstitions in the Pagan world. Hence also the *toleration which belonged to falsehood*, in other words the indifference of men, in regarding all religions as equally good or profitable. But when God's name was proclaimed, hatred commenced, because he is a jealous God, and all others must fall before him.

* Evidences of Revealed Religion, an Appeal to Deists, on their own principles. By S. Thompson.

† Hume's Essays;—the Natural History of Religion.

Hence the early persecutions of Christians, because Christ being the truth, could enter into no compromise with falsehood; men must forsake all for him. And then came a new element into religious exercise,—**MAN'S CONSCIENCE**, awakened by the Lord of conscience. This prepared men to endure persecution for righteousness' sake. A new feature of human character, and its noblest development.

Thus Christ came to send a sword, and not peace on earth; as he made men *sturdy and fanatical*, in asserting principle against human authority: creating spiritual Ishmaels, whose hands were against every man, neither submitting to, nor sparing to denounce Diana of the Ephesians.

This doctrine also, gives unity to the Bible, as all coming from the one only living and true God, who first spoke by the prophets, and now speaks by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things,—the Lord of the universe.

Thus whilst heathenism was local and various, having many gods, Christianity came both as monopolizing and universal; monopolizing, as denying all other gods; and universal, *as claiming the service of all men to this Being alone; BECAUSE he is the only true God.*

NOW IT IS IN OUR COMMON RELATION TO THIS GOD, THAT OUR RELATIONS TO EACH OTHER ORIGINATE AND ARE RENDERED BINDING.

This is easily understood, if we regard any of the relationships of this life: men of the same country, are judicially or legally under obligatory relations to each other, *as subject to the same sovereign, law, or constitution.* Hence laws that do not reach to foreigners, affect real subjects: it is the national or political unity that binds us together. Thus men can trade with each other, or enforce their rights by the aid and protection of a common tribunal. And even nations, come into some shadowy relation of mutual responsibility, by the shadowy connection called the law of nations; or international law. A supposed common tribunal.

For the same reason, God binds the world into one fraternity, making us all amenable to him, and mutually indebted to each other, **BECAUSE HIS LAWS ARE THE FINAL APPEAL FOR ALL OF US.** Truly *final*, because *at the last day*, we shall all stand before him; and there is no reversing his judgment. And this is the first general application of the Bible doctrine of one God; that it constitutes mankind one world-wide nationality of common relations to each other, by the constitution of one divine will, to which we are all subject, and by which we shall be tried.

But secondly, from this spiritual fact arises another and closer relation amongst the individuals of mankind, "*inasmuch as we are ALSO HIS OFFSPRING.*"—(Acts xvii. 28.)—which constitutes us *brethren* as well as fellow subjects;—*one family as well as one community.*

This is enlarging the household, and binding the world in the ties of consanguinity; under the Fatherly blessing and rule of that one "*God who hath made of ONE blood, ALL nations of men for to dwell on ALL THE FACE OF THE EARTH.*"—(Acts. xvii. 26.)

Even as our Lord makes a foreigner our neighbour, even though also a Samaritan, a heretic, or a Catholic; so he hath made every man our brother. Therefore every kindness and every unkindness, "*is all in the family;*" and will not be unnoticed by the universal Father: who is himself our pattern. "Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt

love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.”—(Matt. v. 43—48.) To be true children of our Father, is to take after him; and as we are always minors—under authority—in this family, we are always amenable to this law,—our Father’s example. Nothing is more usual than violating this law,—by loving only those that love us, saluting our adherents as brethren, and others as enemies. The obligations to kindness and good-will, are too readily supposed to be set aside, by the slightest opposition to our wishes; to say nothing of hostility to our persons.

But under this family regulation, we are bound to love even our enemies, both as related to God in nature, who sends temporal bounties to all; and as related to “God in Christ,” who loved us and gave himself for us, that we should “be kind to one another, tender-hearted forgiving one another, even as God, for Christ’s sake hath forgiven us.” Here then is a wide field of duty open to us; we have not to travel far to find our relations; to meet with those who have a natural claim upon us. Nor can we leave our relations behind, without bidding farewell to human society.

What a different face of things would appear in any country, if this truth “were mixed with faith in them that hear it.” If men carried about this practical conviction, that they are God’s children placed here to do the best for their brethren; and to honour their Father in heaven, by imitating his benevolence on earth.

Truly we do not need infidelity to publish and defend liberty, equality, fraternity; it is the true infidelity, the denying of the faith, that leads to the violation of these doctrines, in not providing for our own house,—in forgetting our common brotherhood.

It is in the *Bible* that we find *this*, as the mark of a murderer,—not some atrocious sentiment, some horrible declaration of malice, but this innocent-looking saying, the text from which the life of too many is preached—“Am I my brother’s keeper?” Yes, you are! God has placed you amongst brethren, to help and to be helped: to keep your brother’s person in safety; to keep his reputation from slander; to keep his character from contamination, and to keep his soul from death. And if you live through this life, without doing anything as your brother’s keeper, God who is the keeper of all men, will require it at your hand!

This family relation, then, thus established upon and enforced by the great fact of one God and Father, is the measure of our social duties.

No does it end with private life, it is intended to regulate all international conduct;—“for God hath made of one blood, all nations.” This doctrine, is to extinguish wars, and introduce justice and generosity in the place of force and policy. Formerly, men called upon their different gods, to defend their different countries, saying, as the Syrians said of

Israel, Jehovah their God, "*is the God of the hills and not of the valleys;*" but now *on whom shall we call when we truly recognize one God, as the God of THE WHOLE earth?* To what god will the *English* nation call against the *French*? Or shall we have messengers to heaven—from both nations, troubling the heart of the common Father, to destroy their brethren—his children? And will he listen?

When Israel was his temporal kingdom, he was sometimes the god of battles, but *as often against Israel as for them*; and all was in just retribution for moral purposes; which only his providence could justly enforce.

Whereas now, there is no such peculiar people, and God deals with the world on higher principles.

The true god of battles, as a general system of warfare,—the true god of battles now, is Molock or the Devil. And to thank God for a glorious victory over part of his own family, is to turn churches into charnel houses, and worship God in whited sepulchres.

Whatever Moses and Elias did, the Son of man came to save men's lives, not to destroy them, and he is the pattern for God's entire family. Similar sentiments are forcibly and beautifully expressed by Dr. Arnold.

The "distinctions between race and race, like those between individuals, involve a duty which men have unhappily been unwilling to practise. They who are most favoured by nature owe their best assistance to those whose lot is most unpromising; they who have advanced the furthest in civilization, are bound to enlighten others whose progress has been less rapid.

But here *that feeling of pride and selfishness interposes which, under the name of PATRIOTISM, has so long tried to pass itself off for a virtue.* As men in proportion to their moral advancement learn to enlarge the circle of their regards; as an exclusive affection for our relations, our clan, or our country, is a sure mark of an unimproved mind, so is that narrow and unchristian feeling to be condemned, which regards with jealousy the progress of foreign nations, and cares for no portion of the human race, but that to which itself belongs.

The detestable encouragement so long given to national enmities, the low gratification felt by every people in extolling themselves above their neighbours, should not be overlooked amongst the causes that have mainly *obstructed the improvement of mankind.* Exclusive patriotism should be cast off, together with the exclusive ascendancy of birth, as belonging to the follies and selfishness of our uncultivated nature. Yet, strange to say, the former at least, is sometimes upheld by men who not only call themselves Christians, but are apt to use the charge of irreligion as the readiest weapon against those who differ from them. *So little have they learned the spirit of that revelation, which taught emphatically the abolition of an exclusively national religion and local worship, that so men, being all born of the same blood, might make their sympathies co-extensive with their bond of universal brotherhood.**

This doctrine then, not only tends to extinguish private hatred, but national jealousies; it forbids all wholesale as well as single murders; and enforces generosity as the first element of justice—kindness as our

* Arnold's Thucydides, Vol. i. End of Appendix i.

primary duty. Men say, "be just, before you are generous;" and there is a propriety in this; but our Father who is in heaven says, *be generous as one element of justice*. Amongst men, justice is a kind of legal or commercial term; and means the payment of what may fairly or lawfully be demanded:—lawfully, according to human laws;—fairly, according to human notions, or approved practices; but with God, *justice is WHAT WE OWE UNDER HIS LAW; as children under his roof*. And to do this, to pay what we owe, would more than empty our purse, it would exercise but not impoverish our best affections.

To pay what we owe, is to pay all our energies into the common fund of God's family; to do our best to strike off every fetter; to alleviate every misery; to pour in oil and wine, and take care of our brethren; and this from the deepest regard for human happiness, which results from the highest estimate of human nature, as made for immortality.

We owe much, all that we can accomplish, to the bodies and souls of men; and shall best raise their physical condition, by elevating their spiritual nature; we shall be most likely to do good to men on earth, by believing they are made for heaven; and we shall best bless them here, by preparing them for glory, honour, immortality, and eternal life. All other good is an incidental and probable result; this good is the essential and fundamental benefit.

And the same "one God," who has given us natural faculties, with the possession of his temporal bounty, as a stewardship for the bodies of men; has given us the oil and wine of true healing for their souls, in the gospel of his Son.

So that we are debtors to God, and owe our most strenuous exertions, in that line of highest benevolence in which he has set us the example, and given us the means. "For God *so* loved the world as to give his only begotten Son," that we should not only believe on him and secure "eternal life" ourselves, but that *we* should *so* love the world in imitation of our Father, as to seek men's eternal welfare.

If we have omitted *this*, we have not paid our way; nor taken the true position—"so shall ye be the (approved) children of your Father who is in heaven."

These duties are enforced upon us, not merely by the final judgment, but by a more attractive influence, the motives of love—"Beloved, if God *so* loved us, we ought also to love one another." Nor can anything more certainly secure our love to men, as a matter of steady feeling and active principle, than love towards God: for it is thus he would link us more closely to each other, by binding us all to himself. And "he that loveth him that begot, loveth them that are begotten;" it is in proportion as we love our Father, that we shall truly love our brethren; and hence the gospel lifts us up to communion with God, to fit us for beneficial fellowship with men. "For if a man say he loves God, and hate his brother, he is a liar."

But this principle cannot be attained in its true nature and living energy, unless we have been reconciled to God by Jesus Christ; sons and heirs of God, and thus bound by the cords of love, to the fulfilling of his commandments.

It is by this combination of wisdom and goodness, that God seeks to

bless his family ; as the seed of his mercy is received into our souls, to bear fruit and perpetuate his goodness amongst our fellow men. And as the highest specimen, both of his own loving-kindness and of our duty as brethren in the world, he has set forth Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, that we should be conformed to his image : who was made like to us in suffering and temptation, that we should be made like to him, in patience, self-sacrifice and holiness.

As he laid down his life for us, "we ought also to lay down our lives for the brethren : " as he, by the grace of God the Father, "tasted death for every man ; " so we, out of love to God the Father, should spend our lives for the good of every man, which is the true method of glorifying the one living God.

And thus this doctrine of one God, is the basis of human brotherhood ; affords motives to this common fellowship, in the example and work of Christ, the elder brother and Redeemer of humanity. This first simple Bible truth therefore, is like the sun in outward nature, radiating light in straight lines in all directions : displaying the common hopes and duties of mankind.

Would you then secure human rights, and cultivate generous affections amongst men ? seek a live coal from off the altar of heaven ; let the love of God our Father, through Jesus Christ, kindle your own ; and being thus bound unto him, you will understand the truth and perform the duties of **ONE COMMON BROTHERHOOD.**

II.

PRIESTS' RELIGION.

HUMAN AUTHORITY AND INVENTION *versus* CONSCIENCE AND THE BIBLE.

The Scriptures are the only standard of Christian faith and practice: every one is at liberty to examine them; but no one is at liberty to decline this examination: and though we may receive the help of others, we may not rest on their authority, (which is man-worship;) nor receive as religion, what is not in the Scriptures, (which is will-worship.)

THE REFORMATION REFORMED.

FINALITY is the appropriate doctrine of an omniscient or of an imbecile teacher: it is becoming omniscience to give us confessedly "all the truth," suitable to our condition; but is it suitable only to human weakness and presumption to pretend to have appreciated all that truth, and condensed it into unchangeable formularies and a stereotyped everlasting system of outward observances, or politico-ecclesiastical institutions.

The word of God itself is final, inasmuch as none can wisely go beyond that; but the Church's interpretations and advances towards "the mind of Christ," are as progressive as our investigations into the works of nature. It is for God, and not for man to say, "thus far shalt thou go, and no farther;" it is only for the voice that can place an impassable barrier to the swelling of the ocean, to "put gates and bars" to the tide of human enquiry.

All human breakwaters, or attempts to put the shore in the middle of the sea, can raise only treacherous sands, on which brave vessels may be wrecked.

The Bible is the sea; the covers of the Bible are the only shore and boundary for religious enquiries, to such as receive this for the divine word. Even though the theory we adopt be the Scriptural truth; it is a dangerous principle to rest upon that theory as final, and not to fetch our life and convictions fresh from the Spirit of God; since then our faith stands in the wisdom of men.

But when the theory we adopt is itself unscriptural, and supported only by the assertion, that it containeth nothing contrary to the word of God, the danger is still more obvious.

The evil of this human imposition is in proportion to the number of human beings brought by force or persuasion under its influence; and therefore in a national religion, as a provision for an extensive empire, the mischief is inconceivable, when in addition to the establishment of a new

standard of man's creation, we find in that standard itself many things contrary to the divine standard.

That the formularies of the English Church, contain many such departures from the Scriptures, was demonstrated in our last number, from the Prayer Book itself.

And since many of the laity, and some of the clergy, in that Church, admit that Puseyism is anti-scriptural, we shewed that Puseyism is in the Prayer-Book, and that Puseyism leads to Romanism: therefore, the safest antidote to Rome, so far as England is concerned, is to reform the Prayer Book by the Bible. And this is the point we shall consider in the present enquiry.

But because from the force of men's prejudices, a truth is not willingly received from a source that is unjustly regarded as hostile, we shall fortify this conclusion from such sources as are more likely to be admitted by members of the Church of England.

At the same time, it must not be forgotten by such, that the argument hitherto has been based on what they acknowledge, namely, the Prayer Book itself.

We shall however adduce additional witnesses—first, such as though out of the Church, are not considered so hostile as others; secondly, those in the Church who acknowledge its defects; and thirdly, those who though in the Church, are now attempting to carry out a Bible reformation, and are associating for that purpose.

From the first class of witnesses, we select one, against whom exception will not be taken, who in a "Pastoral Address to his flock," entitled "The Papal Aggression, and Popery, religiously considered," observes:—"There will be more reading and thinking upon questions of ecclesiastical polity than there ever has been. Men *will* think for themselves. Inquiry can neither be stifled nor limited. Investigation must go on; all systems must come to the ordeal. It is only by some such convulsion that men can be roused to examine. The usual course of controversy has not power enough to stimulate a searching trial: a hundred pamphlets, or even volumes, would have less force to awaken inquiry than this one event. The popular voice will ask the question, "Who is right?" and "What is the standard?" We must consent to have all our systems weighed in the balance of the sanctuary—the word of God; and they that cannot stand this, will be swept away as the chaff before the whirlwind. Is not all this good, and are not all things working together to produce it?"

The same author (after declaring his preference of the Church of England to that of Rome, and that he will unite with his brethren of the English Church in resisting the aggression) thus proceeds:—"Nor do we feel disposed, in a spirit of bitter hostility, to avail ourselves of the present state of affairs, as an opportunity to attack the Church of England, instead of resisting the Church of Rome. Yet we are by no means prepared to be silent as regards the unscriptural constitution of the former of these.

"It is impossible to forget that Puseyism has no doubt led to the present aggression of Rome; and Puseyism is the offspring, illegitimate it is contended by its evangelical members, of the Church of England.

"It is indeed a portentous sign for that Church, and one that deserves its most serious reflection, that such a leaning towards Rome, should have been felt by so many of its clergy, and that it should possess either no power or no will to rid itself of the evil. It is clear that, as long this remains, we can never be safe from Papal Aggression. Hundreds of the clergy of the Church of England have, no doubt, been preparing, many of them we fear designedly, this country for restoration to Catholic unity. It cannot be wondered at that many Dissenters knowing this, should feel strongly, and speak somewhat harshly of the evils of our National Establishment. Nor ought any Dissenter to be indifferent to the subject. Charity does not mean indifferentism. We must still continue zealous for the authority of the New Testament; the only Headship of Christ in his Church; the spirituality of his kingdom; the entire independence of the Church of all State control; and the voluntary support of religion by the free-will offerings of its friends. There is much Popery in the Church of England, even by the admission of many of its best supporters, and if they say so, it cannot be wondered at that the affirmation should be believed and repeated by Dissenters. Our Church of England friends cannot but know, and should not forget, that apart from its religious creed, Popery has been in act, cruel, persecuting, and bloody, only by the aid of the civil power. Take away one of its swords, I mean the temporal one, and it may anathematize, but could not kill. Its curses would be only thunder on paper, mere *brutum fulmen*. The principle which in Popery is so dangerous to our liberties is that which she holds in common with every Protestant secular Establishment of religion—the union of Church and State.

"We must therefore stand forth against the Popery of Protestantism, as well as of Rome. We must still continue to lift our voice against those religious distinctions which breed civil discontents and ecclesiastical corruptions amongst ourselves. We cannot but mark and reprobate the inconsistencies in which this union of the secular and the spiritual involves the State where it is maintained. *It is led by policy to do many things which upon principle it must condemn.* Wherefore should the State frown on genuine Roman Catholics, if it rears and shelters in its stipendiary Church a race of counterfeit and mock Romans? Why should the State wonder now at these new demands of a power, with whose ambition it was or ought to have been acquainted, and whose boldness it has increased, and whose encroachments it has encouraged by the smiles it has shed upon it, and the favours it has lavished by various colonial and diplomatic arrangements.

"We cannot help thinking that much of the evil of Popery, and evils of other kinds and from other sources, have arisen from that meddling of the State with the affairs of the Church, and of the Church with the affairs of the State; against which we, as Protestant Dissenters, have ever lifted and must continue to raise our protest.*"

Such admissions respecting the principles and constitution of the Church of England, by one who enjoys the co-operation of many, and the esteem of more, amongst the members of that Church, deserve some consideration in the present crisis.

* The Papal Aggression and Popery contemplated religiously. By Rev. J. A. JAMES.

But we come nearer home, when we adduce the declarations of one who has been for fifty years an officiating clergyman of the Church of England; who still remains in her communion, but has given the result of his experience as his most solemn thoughts in the prospect of eternity.

Besides the light thrown upon this immediate enquiry, by the writer now referred to, we shall find in his quotation from the historian Macaulay, a confirmation of what was formerly asserted in *The Bible and The People*, viz:—that the present Church of England was not the work of the English Reformers, but a compromise through the policy of men in high political positions, and the timeserving of Romish prelates, who took advantage of some of the Reformers' principles, persecuted the Reformers, and gained the credit of the Reformation, together with its emoluments.

But our author and his quotations shall speak for themselves: his pamphlet is thus entitled:—"A Letter to the Right Honourable Lord Ashley, M.P.; being Reflections, at the expiration of fifty years spent in the Anglican Ministry, on the pastoral office and character; including Remarks on the Present Crisis of the Protestant Cause, and chiefly as affecting the perils and responsibilities of the united Church of England and Ireland. By John Riland, M.A., one of the Honorary Chaplains of the Birmingham Magdalen Asylum."

Mr. Riland observes,—“It is undeniable that sectarianism, however disguised by ecclesiastical pretension, discolours the Anglican system. Of this, its partisans and opponents are generally, but variously, conscious. One result is, that *a perpetual stream of self-adulation issues from the lips and writings of Churchmen.* ‘Our pure and apostolical Church’—‘our incomparable liturgy’—‘our sublime simplicity of worship’—‘our high and impregnable position between the errors of Romanism and Dissent’—*these and many other stock phrases constitute the principal of their possessions*; while their poverty glaringly detects itself in the trilateral monosyllable OUR. The plain truth is, that the current of our own Reformation was interrupted early in its progress; and soon coagulated into the ‘Elizabethan Church.’ Mr. Macaulay observes,—‘The English Reformers were eager to go as far as their brethren on the Continent.

Thus Bishop Hooper, who died at Gloucester for his religion, *long refused to wear the episcopal vestments.* Bishop Ridley, a martyr of still greater renown, pulled down the ancient altars of his diocese, and ordered the eucharist to be administered in the middle of churches. . . . *Bishop Jewel pronounced the clerical garb to be a stage dress.* . . . Archbishop Grindal long hesitated about accepting a mitre, from dislike of what he regarded as the mummery of consecration. Bishop Parkhurst uttered a fervent prayer that the Church of England should propose to herself the Church of Zurich as the absolute pattern of a Christian community. *Bishop Poynt was of opinion that the word bishop should be abandoned to the Papists, and that the chief officers of the purified Church should be called superintendents.* When it is considered that none of these prelates belonged to the extreme section of the Protestant party, it cannot be doubted that, if the general sense of the party had been followed, the work of reform would have been carried on as unsparingly in England as in Scotland. *But as the Government needed the support of the Protestants, so the Protestants needed the protection of*

the Government. Much was therefore given up on both sides; an union was effected, and the fruit of that union was the Church of England. . . . To this day the constitution, the doctrines, and the services of the Church, retain the visible marks of the compromise from which she sprang. She occupies a middle position between the Churches of Rome and Geneva. Her doctrinal confessions and discourses, composed by Protestants, set forth principles of theology in which Calvin and Knox would have found scarcely a word to disapprove. *Her prayers and thankgivings, derived from the ancient liturgies, are very generally such as Bishop Fisher or Cardinal Pole might have heartily joined in them.* A controversialist who puts an Arminian sense on her articles and homilies will be pronounced by candid men to be as unreasonable as a controversialist who denies that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration can be discovered in her liturgy. The Church of Rome held that episcopacy was of divine institution, and that certain supernatural graces of high order had been transmitted by the imposition of hands through fifty generations. . . . A large body of Protestants, on the other hand, regarded prelacy as positively unlawful. . . . The founders of the Anglican Church took a middle course. They retained episcopacy; but they did not declare it to be an institution essential to the welfare of a Christian society, or to the efficacy of the sacraments. *Cranmer indeed, plainly avowed his conviction that, in the primitive times, there was no distinction between bishops and priests.*—This historian might have fortified his positions by referring to the writings and proceedings of Archbishops Parker, Whitgift, Abbot, Sancroft, Tillotson, Tenison, Wake, Herring, and Secker; Bishops Horn, Coverdale, Scorie, Pilkington, Burnet, and Stillingfleet; Deans Humphrey, Sampson, and Whittingham; Fox the martyrologist, and Rogers the protomartyr. The late Rev. Legh Richmond says, that having examined Cranmer's MSS. in the Library of C. C. C. Cambridge, it is evident, that the 'temper and opinions of his colleagues obliged him to rest contented with a much more imperfect publicly authorized doctrine than that which he more privately expressed.' WAS NOT THIS THE CASE WITH ALL SUCH AS ARE ACCUSED—BUT OUGHT TO BE CANONIZED—as *ultra-reformers*? The liturgy has many excellencies, but it is not the original work of the Reformers. We are now using its sixth edition. Rituals for a NATIONAL Church ought to be compiled with a caution and foresight which, if possible, should anticipate and defy the powers of misconstruction and antinomian interpretation. For want of this, our own liturgy proceeds upon the *apparent and popular* principle of general or universal salvation. *All* sponsors are addressed as believers. *All* infants are pronounced to be regenerate. *All* catechumens are children of God. *All* successful candidates for confirmation are declared, on episcopal authority, to possess forgiveness of all their sins. *All* sovereigns are most religious. *All* parishioners are instructed by the Rubric to attend three times annually at the Lord's Table. *All* persons are buried with a service—but I come to a pause!

The evangelical party, perfectly aware of this state of things, have sheltered themselves of late years—for the apology is either a revival, or recent discovery—under the pleas of ASSUMPTION and the JUDGMENT OF CHARITY. The very name of the first of these indicates a suspicion or

unwelcome consciousness, of its weakness. The second defence is borrowed from the world, which has perverted a Christian principle to its own uses. Wilberforce writes,—‘It is time to have done with that senseless cant of charity, which insults the understandings, and trifles with the feelings, of those who are really concerned for the happiness of their fellow creatures. What matter of keen remorse and of bitter self-reproaches are they storing up for their future torment, who are themselves its miserable dupes! True charity is wakeful, fervent, full of solicitude, full of good offices not so easily satisfied, not so ready to believe that everything is going on well as a matter of course; but jealous of mischief, apt to suspect danger.’ None but rash speculators, and victims of credulity, regularly act upon the principle of ASSUMPTION in the great interests of life. Experience and common sense are the practical guides of mankind. As to their CHARITY—it never interferes with their avarice and ambition. How was the Gorham question determined—or evaded? By a decision which confessedly decided nothing; and on the kindred principles of assumption and latitudinarianism. It opened a door for the ingress of opposite opinions; and apparently wide enough to admit an Unitarian to the subscription of the Athanasian creed.

“It would be an act of disingenuousness on my own part, if I shrunk from the avowal of an opinion, that *the Tractarians are far more consistent Churchmen than their evangelical opponents*. The fathers of these same opponents did not fall back upon ASSUMPTION and the JUDGMENT OF CHARITY, in defence of their connection with the Church of England; but avowed their difficulties and dissatisfaction, in their published writings, conversation, and posthumous letters.”

Here then we have the acknowledgment of an evangelical clergyman of fifty years standing, that Puseyism is the legitimate doctrine of the Church of England: it is true we do not need such corroborative testimony, having the plain facts before us; but this kind of evidence may satisfy those who are unwilling to believe facts, except pointed to by men of their own Church. Mr. Riland fully condemns his own fifty years professional practice, and advances the following suggestions:—“there is this most serious enquiry before us,—ARE WE TO HAVE A SECOND REFORMATION, not merely to supply the deficiencies and correct the mistakes of the first, but to *elevate the whole of our system into the dignity of a Christian Church, released from the pride, pomp, and circumstance of the world*, and no longer offering allurements to avarice and ambition; remodelling also our liturgical services on principles not to be evaded or mistaken?”

We can scarcely understand from these statements, whether the Rev. Reformer intends the separation of Church and State, as a part of the second Reformation; though his observations will bear that construction: and indeed it is vain to speak of a Bible reformation, that is to be founded on such a violation of Christian principle, as a civil establishment of religion; involving amongst other anomalies, this baneful falsehood—*a National Church*—which can mean only baptized heathendom. “A Church,” the Articles say, “is a congregation of faithful men;” but the nation is not such a congregation; therefore the nation is not a Church.

Mr. Riland is by no means dubious as to his opinions or expressions

respecting the present condition of the Church and the inconsistency of the evangelical clergy, in whose condemnation he of course is willing to share, since after fifty years practice, he still retains the style of clergyman—"honorary chaplain"—whilst writing as follows:—"It is the introduction into the Church of dubious and contradictory positions, and an inflexible adherence to these by such as virtually renounce them in their public and private ministrations—so far a happy inconsistency!—which, at this hour, threatens to convulse the empire."

The danger of formal religion which is cherished by a national institution is well portrayed by our author, who shews clearly the device of Satan, in making a pretence of national religion a pretext for robbing the gospel of its native freedom and power.

"The prince of this world could not indeed extirpate the gospel, and he knew that he could not; but *this* he also knew—that he could hang heavily upon the wheels of the triumphal chariot, in which the Son of God was borne, as he went forth to his ultimate conquests. 'Thou shalt bruise his heel.' At the close of more than eighteen centuries the heathen world lies at his feet, bound in chains of darkness and death. The Christian Church—the universal visible Church—where does *that* also lie? A great portion of it at Satan's feet also; but the fetters are stronger, the darkness deeper, and the death more emphatically death—these things are worse in the Christian world than in the heathen, and why? Because among professed Christians the foe wears a mask, *hides himself under the shadow of the cross*, and throws his fiery darts unseen, unsuspected."

Not only has this device been successful in providing a national cloak, contracting to save a whole empire by a regular set of performances, which will satisfy men's consciences by a shew of decent and respectable religion; but this very sacred pretence becomes a powerful weapon of abuse against all who oppose this secularizing of the gospel: they oppose a national religion, and therefore are charged with being enemies to religion itself; nay desirous of turning their beloved country into an Atheistic community.

Thus does Satan clothe himself as "an angel of light" to fight in the name of religion against those who are its best friends; and to delude with the forms of godliness those who are strangers and enemies to the power thereof.

No reformation of the Prayer Book will remove the root of the evil, which lies in the system itself: *the Prayer Book is that document to which the money is appended*; and therefore an alteration of this, being in reality an alteration of the Church, the property will fairly revert to the State, on the Dissolution of that ecclesiastical constitution with which the State has formerly connected it.

But we must pass on to the second class of witnesses, recognizing the necessity of a new Reformation; viz.: those who are associating in a body to advocate, and if possible, effect that object.

On the fourth of June, the first meeting of a council (appointed at a general Conference the week before) for promoting an efficient reform of the Church of England, was held at the Freemason's Tavern; when the Rev. G. H. Stoddart submitted a series of propositions, intended to form

the basis of the new association. These propositions included the necessity for a thorough revision of the Prayer Book; excluding all Rubrics and expressions liable to be interpreted at variance with Protestantism—a re-arrangement of the services—a modification of subscription, so as to admit diversity in non-essentials—a new body of canons—a closer conformity of the episcopate to the Scriptures—a form of Church government, consisting of an equal number of lay and clerical members—a more equal distribution of Church property.

Rules based upon these propositions, were adopted for the guidance of the Association.

The Conference at which the above meeting was arranged for, was held at the same place, on the twenty-eighth of May; when delegates attended from Liverpool, Birmingham, Carlisle, Plymouth, Reading, Bristol, Bath, Leicester, Colchester, Gosport, Brighton, the Isle of Wight, Bedford, Sheffield, Nottingham, &c.

The following proposition was adopted at that meeting, as the basis of co-operation:—

“That we pledge ourselves to endeavour to carry out the glorious Reformation to its legitimate development, seeking to accomplish, in the same spirit as the early Reformers, the great aims which were checked by the prejudices of the sixteenth century. That we will accordingly endeavour to clear the Church of England of every vestige of Popery then left in the formularies of the Church and her constitution, and from every countervailing impediment to the efficiency of the National Establishment; and that in all matters of mere ceremonial or inferior importance, general union shall be aimed at, rather than strict uniformity; and we will sedulously endeavour to promote a comprehension of evangelical nonconformist Christians, such as was contemplated at the institution of the Savoy Conference, and by the Commission of William III. in 1689.”

All this is simply asserting that they wish to make the Church of England such as that it will be consistent for the evangelical party to remain within it; and is a clear confession that now this party is out of its proper place.

The Church must be altered, to make the evangelical clergy consistent.

They have subscribed to the evils they wish to remove: they have declared by solemn subscription, that “the Prayer Book containeth nothing contrary to the word of God.”

They live upon acknowledged abuses, which they have solemnly sanctioned and are religiously desirous of removing. This is a very unfortunate and questionable position. Their only hope, is to legalize their inconsistencies; to remove the Puseyites by changing what they themselves are bound and have sacredly promised to uphold.

They hold to the Prayer Book, are paid for it, and want to change it, in order to make their position safe and easy; they subscribe to everything and then dissent without retiring from the Church; they live on the wages of untruthfulness.

Several clergymen confessed at the above meeting that they had mutilated the services they had sworn to, and had resorted to many evasions; one had for twenty years avoided the complete service for visitation of the sick; another had played fantastic tricks with the baptismal service,

he "had twisted and turned it in every possible direction, and all to no purpose."

So now they would turn it out, instead of turning out themselves. Their repentance is not deep enough to abandon the wages of sin. Nor are they willing frankly to acknowledge their want of faithfulness: hence the proposition brought forward at the Conference, was softened in one particular, as a poor salvo to their consciences.

Instead of the "vestiges of Popery," they adopted the words—to "clear the Church of England from every ground or pretext for Romish teaching or practices."

This was a pretext of their own; since they know well that these "teachings, &c.," have more than a pretence or pretext in their favour; namely, positive unmistakeable expressions; direct, precise and formal regulations; running through all the formularies contained in that immaculate book—"which containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God."

Why then did not these Reformers retain the phrase "vestiges of Popery?" Simply to save the appearance of consistency in such clergy as might be disposed to join them: as the Vicar of Marton argued—"it would be difficult to induce any clergyman to say that there were vestiges of Popery in the Prayer Book, seeing they had sworn that they gave their full assent and consent to all that was contained therein."

Is not this a pitiable evasion? For they do not deny that there are such vestiges, only must not say so, in order to maintain clerical credit! But will not *any* reform of the Prayer Book, whatever name is given to its defects, be still in opposition to "the assent and consent to all contained therein?"

If the clergy still hold to their subscription, they cannot ask for reform; if they do not hold to subscription, they should come out of the Church, into which they entered by this subscription only.

They cannot serve two masters.

There is no objection to the clergy and laity of the episcopal Church reforming their Prayer Book, when they are freed from the bondage of State support; but whilst the Church is a Government institution, the question is a national one, and till the law is altered it must be obeyed, especially by those who receive legal salary for legal religion. At present, it is for the people of England by the public voice, and their representatives in Parliament, to determine what shall be done in the new reformation, which most acknowledge to be required.

It is an Englishman's not merely a Churchman's question; it amounts to a *revision* of the so-called "constitution in Church and State;" and will include the question of that constitution itself.

Whilst the evangelicals would reform the Prayer Book by the Bible, in order to expel the Puseyites; the true Reformers will examine the whole question by the Bible, in order to expel both. This is the true Bible reformation, to leave religion as the Redeemer left it,—endowed with its own power and his presence—to deal with individual consciences and not with temporal governments; to be established in the convictions of its followers, and not in the enactments of politicians.

This reformation would set both clergy and laity free to adopt their

own course, by the light of God's word, and not by the regulations of an Act of Parliament.

Meanwhile, we may ask our evangelical friends, *why it is THEY ALONE who seek a reform of the Prayer Book?* The Puseyites are well enough satisfied with it, simply because it is in favour of the Puseyites; whilst the evangelicals would like an alteration of this or that sentence, Rubric, office, &c., because they know that the Prayer Book as it exists, though signed *ex animo* by every one of them, is a standing protest against the evangelical clergy.

III.

STATESMEN'S RELIGION.

"EVERY PLANT WHICH MY HEAVENLY FATHER HATH NOT PLANTED, SHALL BE ROOTED UP."—(Matt. xv. 13.)

In those who think a National Church right, Dissent is a sin; in those who think it wrong, silence is a shame.

THE THEORY OF INTOLERANCE,

AS INVOLVED IN THE NAMES AND WORDS APPLIED TO RELIGIOUS PARTIES AND DOCTRINES.

THERE is a sort of persecution, which does not reach to life or limb, but proceeds in the more refined method, of lowering persons in the social scale;—sending them marked and proscribed through the world. This is the sanctuary to which bigotry has retired for her last stronghold; and many persons who are too liberal to defend this principle in its grosser forms; are deluded by this milder personification. But when they find that it is the old enemy, dressed up in more modern equipments, they will be prepared to renounce the alliance altogether, and extend to others, the privileges they claim for themselves. It is for the serious consideration of such parties (more especially) that we propose to examine *the theory of intolerance, as implied in opprobrious names.*

It is sometimes too confidently assumed, that heat and bigotry are confined to religious men. But wherever there is a disregard for the sacredness of private convictions, there is intolerance.

There is, in the first place, the Infidel and pseudo-philosophic intolerance, on the part of those who undervaluing all religion, sneer at religious men. These have one apt name, "fanatic," by which they compress all logic into three syllables, and readily set aside all earnest principle.

Such philosophers are quick in discerning the uncharitableness displayed in religious contests; and therefore, very charitably and consistently vilify all opinions on these subjects, except that one opinion, which votes religion a cheat, and religious men hypocrites;—which modestly assumes that sense and ungodliness are never divorced.

Yet some persons naturally fall into the opinion, that the indifference of the irreligious often leads them to persecute: that such philosophers regard all earnestness on points of faith, as mere folly,—*one superstition being as good as another*: that Atheists and Infidels are often Tories in politics, and persecuting in principle: that having no conscience, they believe

in none : that philosophers, who see no good in any religion, often see no harm in keeping up the State trick and popular delusion : that they abet superstition, out of contempt for religion : that being so far advanced themselves, they have no patience for the slowness of others,—(who still thinking one form of religion better than another, are not willing to wear any livery with philosophic indifference :)—that many of these philosophers, being too profound to be disturbed with religious scruples, are apt to force others into the same pliancy ; or, if this fail, to punish and revile them for being fools, and making themselves singular.

There is another sort of intolerance—namely, that of political men ; who often use religion for political purposes ; persecute men for religious opinions, *because they believe certain political principles are connected with them* : and so throw the odium of oppression, on the dishonoured cause of religion. But these parties, not only persecute politically under the mask of religion ; they shew undisguised political intolerance. Orthodox Christians, have the names heterodox, schismatic, &c., to hurl at dissentients ; and political powers have the name of “ sedition ” as a ready condemnation of those who advocate the rights of the weak, against the wrongs of the powerful.

Heretical books have been burnt, and their authors punished : Rome has her index expurgatorius, and indexes of forbidden books ; and so also Statesmen can defend the State.

The real Napoleon decreed (and is imitated by the sham Napoleon) that the Paris newspapers should insert nothing “ derogatory of the respect due to the institutions of the country, the sovereignty of the people, and the glory of the French armies.* ” The exact amount that was really due to these things, he did not state : but of course *he* would be the sole judge of this. The same kind of ambiguity belongs to the English law of libel.

“ On the trial in the cause, entitled, the King against Cobbett ; 24th May, 1804, Lord Ellenborough said, ‘ it is no new doctrine, that if a publication be calculated to alienate the affections of the people, *by bringing the Government into dis-esteem*, whether the expression be ridicule or obloquy, the person so conducting himself, is exposed to the inflictions of the law ;—it is a crime.’ ”† All Government persecutions for libel, and many personal cases (which involve party interests) indicate the same thing : namely, that political intolerance, sometimes in its own name, sometimes under the garb of religion, is as common as religious bigotry.

“ Constructive treason,” is a political net of the same sort ; and those who aim after freedom, should examine what is the real germ of it :—the native right of men to entertain and disseminate opinions, without any other hindrance than that of better opinions and counter arguments. This is the great question of the day ; the “ rights of man,” freedom in its very flower and quintessence ;—unshackled thoughts, and unrestrained expression. *This* is at the foundation of all such movements as “ the League ; ” for had freedom of thought been repressed ; freedom of commerce could not have been obtained.

* Knight's Political Dictionary ; article—“ Censorship of the Press.”

† See Edinburgh Review, May, 1811. “ The Liberty of the Press.”

It is the combination of individual judgments, against the chains of prescription and authority;—the united efforts of private individuals in hastening the advance of intelligence;—it is the true “universal suffrage,” which gives every man the right, and teaches every man the duty, of giving his vote on every question, in which he is concerned: instead of the old heroic “shepherd of the people,” who drove his sheep to the pasture or to the slaughter, according to his royal will and pleasure. It teaches men no longer (after this blind fashion) to “follow the leader;” but by public opinion, (which is the united voice of private persons) to guide the leaders themselves. Upon such tendencies however, it is natural for those in authority to look with suspicion; and hence arises that political intolerance, which is not less fierce than misdirected religious zeal.

State trials and State jealousies, under all forms of Government, and for whatever immediate object,—whether to repress agitation for the extension of popular freedom; or to build up priestcraft as a buttress to king-craft;—these all shew that intolerance is not confined to the “fanatics.”

But does this make intolerance any better—to shew that Infidels and pseudo-philosophers, that tyrants and political parties, have their share in this spirit? no: but it proves that those men who charge intolerance on to religion alone, have need to sharpen their wits, as well as to mend their temper.

There has been—not only the odium theologicum, but the odium, logicum; as displayed between the followers of Aristotle and deserters or improvers: the odium philosophicum; as displayed in many contests: the odium literarium, (perhaps the most acid;) as exhibited in the “battles of books;” the quarrels about “long and shorts” and various readings: indeed in everything we have had the “big endians, and little endians,”* and the greatest heats, about the smallest trifles.

It is not therefore religion which is intolerant; nor religious men alone, who have been exclusive and bigoted: but it is human nature which is vain and selfish; and which has exhibited its tendencies on every subject, and in every society. It is our natural pride, by which every man becomes the god of his own idolatry; and whoever does not fall down to worship, is thereby convicted of heresy and schism.

This is the grand “idol of the tribe,”—the arch heresy of mankind;—pride or self-worship; and this is at the foundation of all attempts after a monopoly of reverence and power.

But whatever arguments elevate us in our own estimation, may in the estimation of others, equally elevate them; and so leave us all upon a level:—the dignity of any man, so far as it based on human nature, belongs to all; and to shew how much we respect ourselves, we should respect others, to whom the common Creator has been equally bountiful.

If, therefore, we reverence conscience and principle, in ourselves; we have the same reason to reverence the convictions of all men; and if as is both natural and right, we wish to lead others into our views, we should

* Two fierce Liliputian sects, differing as to the best method, (not of roasting eggs, in which there would be some reason, but) of commencing the repast:—whether to begin at the large or small end of the egg.

do it, by leading them through our own line of experience and thought;—exhibiting to them those lights which have so happily guided us.

Hitherto unfortunately, the contrary method has been adopted;—not to convince others by argument, but to bind them by power, or refute them by calumny. To seize at once upon the whole territory of truth as our own; and proclaim as outlaws, all who are out of our own boundaries. The most effective means hitherto employed for this purpose, have been the use of opprobrious names for others, and the application of a flattering title to ourselves; which at once sums up the argument and settles the controversy. And thus it will be found, that most parties have a name ready for their opponents, which implies condemnation: and one for themselves which concedes the palm without controversy. One set of politicians, is called “tory” by enemies; but assumes the name of “conservative:” another is called, democratic, radical, innovating; but assumes the name of reformer. We have not however to adjust these matters, but to shew that the influence of bigotry and assumption, is seen in names generally; whilst our immediate object is to shew the principle of intolerance discoverable in religious names. There is a whole quiver full of objuratory words, which form the missile weapons of party controversialists, who often refute a doctrine, by shooting at it a nickname.

“None of the modes of assuming what should be proved, are in more frequent use than what are termed by Bentham ‘question-begging appellatives;’ names which beg the question, under the guise of stating it. The most potent of these are such as have a laudatory or vituperative character. For instance in politics, the word innovation. The dictionary meaning of this term, being merely a ‘change to something new,’ it is difficult for the defenders of even the most salutary improvement to deny that it is an ‘innovation;’ yet the word having acquired in common usage a vituperative connotation in addition to its dictionary meaning, the admission is always construed as a large concession to the disadvantage of the thing proposed.”*

Nicknames are of three sorts; (1) personal epithets of opprobrium or insult; which are now generally abandoned to the ignoble vulgar: and therefore, leaving this inferior section of Billingsgate (for these things as much involve bad manners, as bad morals and false logic:) leaving these, we may notice the second sort of names which are uttered by lips fastidious, and approved by ears polite; namely, (2) epithets of a more general application; party stigmas, wholesale slanders; and “compressed calumnies” affixed to an entire community. These are by no means vulgar: for the grossness is redeemed by the boldness, just as wars eclipse private assassinations, and become glorious from excess of infamy; light from excessive darkness, (like polished ebony): so to murder a single reputation, is mean: to nickname one man, is a low sort of vulgarity; but to slander a body of men, by the application of some fit epithet, is to become chivalrously eloquent.

(3) The third sort of ill-names includes the *miscalling ourselves*, to the disparagement of others: assuming a banner which floats all rivals, and claims the entire honour for our own paltry regiment.

It is obvious that this third method, includes the second; for to assume

* Mill’s Logic, vol. ii. p. 462.

peculiar goodness, is to insinuate general wickedness: and if I be orthodox, there needs no other proof that those who presume to differ, are notoriously heterodox.

We proceed therefore to examine the more prominent names amongst religious parties, good and bad, which have been assumed on the one hand, and given on the other: and to discover the principles involved in them.

The grand father name, is the term "THE CHURCH;" with which much conjuring has been done; we shall first scrutinize the father—and secondly, his discordant progeny.

"What this (the Apostolical Church) is," says Pearson, (on the Creed Art. 9, p. 370,) "is easily determined; for it was a certain number of men, some of whom were Apostles, some former disciples; others were persons which repented and believed, and were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ; and continued hearing the word preached, receiving the sacraments administered, and joining in the public prayers presented unto God: this was *then* the Church;" but this is not the Church *now*; at least the orthodox method of enquiry seldom leads men in that direction. "The Church," he adds farther on, "in the language of the New Testament, doth always signify a company of persons professing the Christian faith." And this is in exposition of that article in "The Creed," "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." But how can we believe in it, if it mean us the believers? And how can we (as some imply) be saved by it, if it mean us, the persons who are saved? And how can we, who constitute the Church, be the "sons of the Church;" unless we can become our own mother, and our own children?

No doubt, the belief that there *is* a Church, is different from believing in, or trusting to it; but the formulæ on this subject, are generally so happily worded, that these two things are readily confounded. Indeed, the obvious intention of Creeds on this subject, has generally been, not to express a belief in a Church's existence, but a reliance on its power.

For St. Cyprian* thus expresses it, "*cum* (schismatici) dicunt, *credis remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam per sanctam ecclesiam?* Mentiuntur in interrogatione, cum non habeant ecclesiam. When the Schismatics enquire—do you believe in the forgiveness of sins and eternal life by the Church, (*i. e.* through its agency;) they lie (tacitly) by the enquiry: since they have not the Church, (as their question assumes, and therefore they cannot confer forgiveness of sins, and eternal life.)"

This makes the Church, which is composed of believers, the object of its own faith, and the agent in its own salvation. This statement respecting the doctrine of "The Church," appears to have been general: thus another writer ("Author of the fourth book *De Symbolo ad Catechumenos*") says, "*Propterea hujus conclusio Sacramenti per S. Ecclesiam terminatur, quoniam si quis absque ea inventus fuerit alienus erit a numero filiorum, nec habebit Deum Patrem, qui ecclesiam noluerit habere Matrem.* For this reason, the conclusion of the sacrament ends with—'By the Holy Church;'—because, whoever shall be found outside this Church, will be excluded from the number of (her) children; *nor shall he have God for his father, who will not have the Church for his mother.*"

* As quoted by Pearson. See Notes, p. 367, on the Creed.

This is ecclesiastical profane wit, or pious punster's blasphemy; which not content with playing a cheat upon the world, by the aid of the name "Church," must put four persons into the Trinity; insult the Father; and spoil the gospel figure of the marriage between Christ and his Church. The Church is the bride, the Lamb's wife; and therefore cannot be the mother in that regeneration by which we are born from above, and become sons of God.

"The existence of a Church," says Pearson, (376) "hath been propounded as an object of faith, in every age of Christianity; for those who are believers, are the Church; and therefore, (1) if they do believe, they must believe there is a Church." This is a curious method of proof: the thief on the Cross had no spare time to speculate about a "Church," he was occupied with himself and his Saviour, and so became a true Churchman, most probably without knowing it.

The existence of A Church, *is never propounded as an object of faith*, but the certainty of one, arises from our reasonable expectation that Christ will never be without followers; an expectation that forms no part of essential truth, and is not based upon immediate revelation, so much as upon general deductions from it. Nor is the question of any real consequence in itself, though it has received prominence from the hands of men who have been ignorant on the one hand, and designing on the other. The enquiry is one on which the Bible does not start us. Individualism is the great principle of the gospel; and this principle has found its way into general, social, and political questions: men are not now lumped together, into "an age," "a nation;" but each man having a soul, and complete personality, is beginning to be regarded as a separate item, in this wholesale reckoning: so also in religion, *the Church* is not the first question; *it never was the question brought forward by our Lord and his disciples*, when they sought to instruct the ignorant: nor have we now so much to decide what constitutes "The Church," as, what constitutes a Christian: and then the other enquiry will become wonderfully simplified.

The gospel came to answer the question, what is a Christian; not to tell us what is the Church: it is not a revelation of the Church, but *to the Church*: it displays Jesus Christ, and whoever believes in him, becomes part of "The Church" by that act; he cannot by any other process.

We have not so much to enquire what style will be adopted in "God's building," as what materials he will use; and how far we are becoming polished stones in his hands. Christ came from the bosom of the Father, to reveal the Father; and *those who come from the bosom of the Church, to reveal her*; interfere with his mission; and contravene his gospel.

When we say, that the enquiry—what is the Church?—is one of minor importance, we mean primarily and in itself: but considering the errors and assumptions, widely spread on this subject, it is important to understand the question; to see that whatever the Church be, a man must be a Christian before he can belong to it. The geography of a country or a sect, cannot prescribe the boundary of the Apostolical Church, or assemblage of believers.

It is a nice logical exercise, to explain the jugglery that has been practised by the help of this magical name. For instance, "all believers

are in the Church; but you, schismatic, Dissenter, or whatever name you may choose,—you are not in the Church; and therefore are no true believer: nor can you have any safety, for the Lord added to *the Church* daily the saved ones.”

Which argument stated fully is, “no one who does not belong to the *true primitive Church*, is a believer; for it contained all believers: but you do not belong to *our Church*; and therefore are no true believer.”

And this reasoning would do very well, if there was not one thing in the premises and another in the conclusion: it fails only in starting with Christ's Church, and concluding with Peter's or Pusey's: which unfortunately vitiates the patent: since in the “specification,” one thing is named; and in practice, another thing is protected. The legitimate inference is, the primitive Church being composed of all believers; every believer, whether Churchman or Dissenter, is in the primitive Church: i. e. the Church founded by the Apostles.

2. The second name to be examined, is the term “Holy Catholic Church;” not the “Roman Catholic Church;” which is a particular universal, and involves a contradiction.

The phrase “Catholic Church,” was evidently invented by “the fathers,” as a pale of bigotry, by one bold assumption to enclose the orthodox and shut out the heterodox. It was a compendious method of finishing a controversy, by setting up a new standard of truth, which amounted to this,—you differ from us, and therefore are wrong.

This subterfuge is a complete refutation of those who adopt it; for if the Scriptures, the legitimate authority, had sanctioned these men, they would not have been driven to so poor a shift. That Church, which is of Scriptural origin, may prove its pretensions from Scripture, without falling back upon its own assumption.

The name “Catholic Church,” is not to be rejected, provided it be understood in its true meaning; *for instead of affording a shelter for uniformity and intolerance, it provides for and anticipates diversity and charity.* “Catholic,” means general, and implies particulars: it is a whole and supposes parts: and these parts must differ one from another. The Catholic Church is the genus; and every genus must of necessity have two or more species under it, which species are marked off from each other by *differentia*. Thus “tree,” is a genus, or general name; a universal whole; which is divided into the several sorts of trees (or species) as ash tree, elm tree, oak tree. So the general term, Catholic Church, if it be not a misuse of language; is a large class, including *several sorts of Churches*; that is, Churches differing from each other, not in generic (or Christian) qualities; but in subordinate, (denominational) peculiarities.

Consequently, this word, instead of becoming the shibboleth of bigotry; by becoming the nickname of a self-worshipping section; should be used in its only consistent meaning; not for a *particular* party; (since it is a *general* term;) but for the universal bond of fellowship, (the common, generic, Catholic or Christian tie,) by which Christians of every name are united. And thus it would take the place of that fiction, (which would then be a fact,)—“I believe in the communion of saints.” For the Catholic Church is the bond of that communion; it is the common

ground of agreement, for those who in other respects disagree; and not a hedge of briars, to separate Christians from each other.*

3. The next shape of the term Church, is "THE NATIONAL CHURCH;" which according to the Scriptural meaning of the term Church, is a nation of believers; not mere outside, white-washed heathen; but *Christians*. This phenomenon has not yet appeared; and we must wait in patience for it, till the Millennium. Meanwhile, this fiction of a National Church, serves as a new measure of duty; a new standard of orthodoxy and heterodoxy; as well as of danger and safety.

The opprobrious epithets arising out of this and the preceding names, we have yet to consider: but may first consider another politico-ecclesiastical term, "SUPREMACY."

4. In the Roman Catholic Church, this supremacy belongs to his holiness the Pope: in the English National, or *Anglo-Catholic* (!) the supremacy belongs to our "most gracious and religious" Sovereigns; who form a small popedom, by helping to partition the spiritual jurisdiction of Christendom into lesser principalities.

And this partitioning, is all that some seem to understand by Protestantism. "Henry VIII." says Milton, "was the first that rent this kingdom from the Pope's subjection totally; but his quarrel being more about supremacy, than other faultiness in religion; it is no marvel that he stuck where he did. The next default was in the bishops, who though they renounced the Pope, they still hugged the popedom, and shared the authority among themselves." But the formal supremacy, the acknowledged national popedom, was claimed by Henry VIII., and confirmed to succeeding Sovereigns.

Indeed, this is with some the entire question of Protestantism;—shall monarchs any longer be vassals to Rome: any more do that homage which is a fair indication of an enslaved, crouching, and abject soul: or shall they be independent; and take their own kingdom in their own right;—not from the hand of a foreign meddling priest? In other words, *the Reformation in their view was not so much the freedom of conscience, as the freedom of kings*. This reduces Protestantism to a squabble for the supremacy:—shall the Church, crown and depose kings, or shall kings establish and dis-establish Churches? Shall the Pope alone, lord it over the subject's conscience; or shall the king take it in hand:—in other words, WHICH ROBBER SHALL HAVE THE BOOTY?

If you object to the Pope, and set up the Monarch; that is a sort of Protestantism which must in turn be protested against.

The only legitimate "supremacy," is the one Pearson describes, (372) "now as several Churches are reduced to the denomination of one Church, in relation to the single governor of those many Churches; so all the Churches, of all cities and all nations in the world, may be reduced to the same single denomination; in relation to ONE SUPREME Governor of them all, and that one Governor is Christ, the Bishop of our souls."

* The above argument, is simply intended as an explanation of a theological (not a Scriptural) term; and to shew how consistently with the law of language it should be employed;—being properly the symbol of unity with diversity; not of exclusiveness with uniformity.

This passage also illustrates, particular Churches, and the Catholic Church; the particular Churches, being distinguished from each other, by their various human modifications; the Catholic Church being composed of all these separate Churches, in their combined capacity as united in the ONE SUPREME BISHOP.

Thus far then, we have examined the name, "The Church;" and have seen that, as applied to any body of Christians exclusively, it is a fallacy in logic, a mere petitio, and is also a breach of Christian charity; since whilst being a self-laudatory name, it conveys censure and condemnation of others.

That the term Catholic Church, as applied to a particular society, is a contradiction in terms; and so is nonsense as well as assumption: whilst applied to all Christians, it is a symbol both of sense and charity; being the true bond of union; instead of the boundary of separation.

That the name National Church, is a fiction; (unless we alter the meaning of the word Church :) and that supremacy is usurpation, whether committed by a Pope or a King;—except the supremacy of the Redeemer.

Here then we have two standards, (1) Churches established by Jesus Christ,—i. e. the true universal, or Catholic Church, consisting of all believers: including of course, the various divisions of that Church, viz., all sorts of true Christians.

(2) Churches invented and established by men; either from priestly or Civil Power;—the divine (!) right of kings, or the divine right of popes.

These two standards may be applied to men, and according to the relation in which any person stands to them, will be the name he receives from the authorities of the one or the other.

The judgment that will be passed upon individuals on account of their belonging or not belonging to the Church of Christ, we may with humility and safety leave in the hands of the only Judge, and with the conscience of each person: but the *anticipatory judgments* which men pass upon those who wander out of human boundaries, we may properly examine.

These judgments are very brief; they seldom amount to a "sentence," but are compressed into a word, such as heretic, schismatic, heterodox; Nonconformist, Dissenter.

Such names, express the relation in which persons stand to a tribunal that men have erected.

And in these condemnations, there is implied a denial that all judgment is committed to the Son; since "judgment" it seems, is the prerogative of certain Churches and supremacies.

The enquiry here, is not which party is Scriptural in its doctrines; nor is it, as too often has been the case, both on the part of the persecuted and of persecutors,—*which* being right, has the claim to predominance? but to prove, that truth and right, possessed by whomsoever, give no licence to any one, to shame the truth by doing wrong;—that whoever in spirit, imitates the writ de hæritico comburendo, deserves to have issued out against himself, the writ de lunatico inquirendo, since he is plainly unfit to take care of himself, who fancies he is empowered to take care of other people.

Let us consider first, the name *DISSENTER*: this implies a standard, viz., the National Church: and some disgrace or sin, in separating from it:—hence the question—“Are Dissenters justified by the word of God, in separating from the Church of England?” As if the “word of God,” ever said anything about the Church of England,—except in that one passage, “hear the Church:” “save for this one voice,” the Scriptures were never guilty of mentioning the Church of any country. But this question, is strangely unfortunate, since it attacks three great principles, on which the honour of man and the glory of Christ depend: namely, the natural rights of mankind in general: the dear-bought privileges of believers in particular: and the authority of Jesus Christ.

But defenders of the national faith, are in a very advantageous position, since, though by such assumptions as the above, they deny the essence of Protestantism—private judgment, (which allows every man for himself to decide how far he is justified)—though this be denied, these champions of the Church Militant wield a two-edged sword; using the arguments of Dissenters against Papists, and of Papists against Dissenters. Thus preserving that golden mean, (of which so much has been sung or said, between Popery on the one hand, and fanaticism on the other. Indeed this golden mean, is made up of the two extremes, and therefore is equally distant from either of them; (since it is at no distance at all) for true Churchmen include both; being Popes towards Dissenters, and Dissenters towards Popes.

Hence, it is obvious that *the name Dissenter is a disgrace to Churchmen*: since if Churchmen did not directly impose it,—if it was assumed as milder than “Heretic,”—who took that position of authority,—the chair of Moses or of Peter, which gave the *position* of Dissent?

In general, names should not involve theories, but express facts; they should be descriptions of what unquestionably exists; and not embody hypotheses which require proof.* This name, Dissent, implies a standard, and assumes its authority; and therefore is a bold petition.

For, from whom do these persons profess to Dissent?—from truth? “No, they pretend to love that.” From the Bible? “No, they adopt that as their standard.” From whom or what then do they differ? “From us.” From you! “Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?”—members of an infallible Church? “No: but of one that never errs.”

The writer who has set forth the sin of Dissent, with the greatest force of wit and eloquence, is Doctor South; for we pass by this charge, as brought forward by the modern Tractarians, to engage with the vigour of manhood, rather than with the tottering dotage of these modern antiques.

In a sermon on the “true state and account of a tender conscience;” he shews that the “weak” “were not yet so perfectly and entirely

* “The greatest fault in Werner’s system, is the theoretical language which it employs; by which hypothesis is interwoven with the description of every phenomenon. Hence, theory is constantly employed in what is the business of description; it becomes difficult to separate the fact from the hypothesis; and very difficult, *on that account*, when you are to argue to be sure you are not reasoning in a circle.”—Ed. Rev. May, 1811. It will be a great advance in knowledge, when men perceive *the universality of a principle*; and apply these general truths to social questions.

Christians, but that they still observed the ordinances of the Mosaic Law, as supposing it still in force:" a weakness for which we who are not new converts, have no excuse; since we have the instruction of a true Christian Church. But this divine overlooks the fact, that it is not Dissenters, but the strong or enlightened consciences (*i. e.* State-Church-men) who commit the same mistake as the primitive weak brethren. For are we not perpetually carried back to the school of Moses; instead of being allowed the freedom of men in Christ?

Are not National Churches, based and defended, upon the faded idea of the abrogated Jewish theocracy? So that the instructions of this Church, can never render us inexcusable for a mistake on which the Church itself is based. The weakness of the primitive believers consisted in laying too much stress on Moses; and therefore we Dissenters do not commit *this* mistake,—by leaving Moses altogether, and following the more perfect guide.

The second sort of weak consciences, according to our Author, (and he is right in each case, as to the nature of the weakness; but did not apply it properly to existing parties:)—the second sort of weak consciences, consisted of those who objected to eating meat that had been offered to idols; though this had afterwards been sold in the shambles: it is allowed that these were right in abstaining; and that others, with clearer views, were right in eating; *but were to do it in private*, so as not to embolden others to act against conviction.

Take it then, that Church consciences are strong and Dissenters weak, in this second sense; and how stands the application? Plainly thus; you Church-men, are perfectly right, in thinking certain forms of worship and methods of support allowable; and Dissenters are weak, unenlightened in not thinking the same: nevertheless, do not from your liberty, take liberties with others: nay more, have your freedom, (that is your State-Churchmanship) to yourselves; in your own private houses; and in public, give way in all these matters: and sink your own liberty out of regard to the weaknesses of Dissenters.

When did we have such a specimen of the strong bearing the infirmities of the weak?

But our Author, proceeds to shew, how a weak conscience may be wounded; that is, led to violate its convictions; (*which violation would be a sin, even if the conviction be mistaken:*) this effect is produced then "1st. *By example.* 2ndly. *By command.*" Now in each of these methods, the Church has wounded the weak consciences of Dissenters: 1st. she gives us the example of doing openly what we think wrong: and 2ndly. she is not content with this, (which in many things is defensible) but has used coercion in grosser forms, and now uses it by the subtler influences, which are equally effective; though more refined according to the spirit of the age.

But the preacher, evidently feared this application of his canon; and foresaw how, were he on the other side, it might legitimately be applied; and therefore shuts out from us this retort—(which he did not venture to mention, thinking it safer only to provide against what would readily strike those who examined the subject;)—he is forewarned, and so becomes forearmed; by shewing what ingredients are essential to a primitive

weak conscience. Namely, 1st. "a natural incapacity in the understanding faculty: 2ndly. the want of opportunities and means of knowledge." The former weakness we never pretended to: indeed, we must admit it would be a fatal plea; since if our dissent rested on a professed absence of wits; it would be a fair reason against its being allowed: we should need a manager; this shuts us out from the first plea; and South excludes us from the second; for absence of means cannot be pleaded, by those who have or *may have* the Church's instruction. "So that they are without excuse." "Men," says he, "mistake the method of disputing with these pretenders to weak consciences now-adays; not considering that the supposition that they either have, or *can have*, a weak conscience, ought not to be granted to them.

The Apostle indeed, we are told, speaks of such consciences *then*, but these cannot exist *now*, for first, though the Jews had some excuse in their ancient prejudices, there is no room for prejudices now; and secondly, the means of instruction are *now* ample. What then, have the "successors" gone beyond their predecessors; and do they know more than this same Apostle, who whilst in himself "an ample means of instruction," yet could excuse certain differences in sentiment, even amongst those under his teaching?

But this superiority of the modern over the ancient teaching, was necessary in order to complete the argument: Paul shewed that the "weak" should be yielded to: South shews they should be forced: what then is the reason for this difference? merely the difference in the circumstances of men; hence, from our *present advantages*, we have no cloak for our sin; *they*—poor men! had only Apostles for their teachers, and might consequently entertain scruples, but what can Dissenters plead, who have the more sure word of "the Church?"

Paul, being a less perfect teacher, should make up in forbearance: but our later guides, having more knowledge, may exhibit less charity. Accordingly, (*i. e.* consistently with this less degree of charity,) South concludes, "it is not weakness, but want of conscience, which is the true distemper of those persons who at this day disturb the Church." Our preacher, is at least firm in his conclusion, perhaps to make up for the weakness of his premises.

We next learn from the same source, that were our consciences ever as weak, they must be disregarded, for "can anything be fuller of contradiction and ridiculous paradox, than to think to reconcile the sovereignty of the magistrate, and the safety of the Government, with the sturdy pleas of dissenting consciences." This is making clear work at once; but *what* is the sovereignty of the magistrate, and what is the office of the Government? That his spiritual sovereignty cannot be reconciled with our freedom of conscience, is evident. But which is of the greater consequence, the magistrate's authority, or our freedom? If therefore, they cannot be reconciled, let the less important be given up. And if the office of Government, is interfered with by the government of Christ, then the earthly Government has plainly stepped out of its province, into that of him, whose "kingdom is not of this world:" but can these two things be reconciled? No: must then the King of Kings retreat, and leave his subjects at the mercy of supreme sovereigns, and political Governments?

Our preacher then has not done enough, in shewing that two things are contradictory; he should shew which of them is false.

The rule of logic respecting "contradictories," is, *that always one is true and the other false*: and therefore the business of a reasoner, is not to end with contradictions, but out of the two propositions, to shew which is the truth, and which the falsehood. But if we must have assumption in the process, it would be more reasonable to assume that Christ has a spiritual "government," whose "*office*" is to manage dissenting consciences,—whilst kings may deal with rebellious subjects, in all those matters to which their subjection should extend.

We deny therefore the spiritual sovereignty of the magistrate; but admit his political supremacy; which is not contradicted by freedom of conscience in spiritual matters.

This spiritual freedom, (besides being the obvious native right of man, and essential to his obedience to God,) was sturdily asserted by Peter; "whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye."—(Acts iv. 19.) How then does Peter reconcile this sturdy plea of a dissenting conscience, with that command in his own epistle—(1 Pet. ii. 13.)—"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well?" But let Peter still further defend himself, against the following accusation: "how impossible had it been, for the Christian religion to have made such a spread in the world, had it owned such anti-magistretical assertions, (as Peter and Dissenters make) either by its avowed principles, or by the practices of its primitive professors?"*

* South's Sermon on "Obedience for Conscience's sake, the duty of good subjects."

(To be concluded in our next.)

IV.

SCEPTICS' RELIGION.

Under this department, sceptical objections, and systems or principles advocated as hostile to Christianity, are dispassionately considered.

PASSAGES IN THE LIFE OF AN ENQUIRER.

(Continued from page 282.)

CHAP. IV.

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE CONFESSIONS OF A PHOENIX—THE ART OF SINKING IN PROSE—AN ENCOUNTER—THE SMALL-SWORD.

Young from the glow he shakes his wings,
Winning a skimmering skeen,
More youthful, bright, and fairer far,
Than ever he had been.—*Wolfram von Eschenbach.*

Of all the fabulous birds that have in different ages and countries delighted the lovers of the marvellous, commend us to the phoenix. The simurg—"that old and only bird,"—as Southey calls him in *Thalaba*, is a respectable personage: yea, as described by D'Herbelot, and, above all, as sung by the celebrated Sufi poet, Fedreddin Attar, he is invested with attributes that are even awful. Does he not dwell in profound repose, pruning from time to time his giant plumage, among the topmost snows of Kaf—as the Mahometans call Caucasus? Has he not twelve times seen the grand revolution of seven thousand years, and seven times beheld the earth de-populated and re-peopled? The roc of the Arabian Nights, who carries off the elephant and the rhinoceros together, inextricably entangled in their death-struggle, is by no means to be despised. But the simurg lives too much retired, is too much of the old, even of the Pre-Adamite school; while the roc, on the contrary, lives too much in action and too little in contemplation; is a mere hunting, feeding animal, and a most notorious glutton withal. There is the true combination in the life of the phoenix:—he sails away over land and sea, studies men and manners for an age, and when he begins to find himself getting crotchety and antiquated in his notions, and that the times are a-head of him, he prepares his sweet-cented pipe, broods among the flames as in a nest, and rises from his ashes—leaving there the timidity and the coldness of age—with all the buoyancy and strength and courage of glorious youth. What wonder that Wolfram von Eschenbach—the pride of the golden

age of early German poetry, should have extolled this bright creation of the fancy as he has done,—that the phoenix should have visited the dreams of every dreamer in the middle age—the messenger-bird of imagination? But we must have a care:—if we get into the middle ages and among the Parzivals, and Titurels, and Trevrezents of the old romances about Montsalvage and the Gral there will be no stopping us, and farewell to Roger and Louise. It is strange, though, that neither Swift, nor Sterne, nor Lesage, nor Jean Paul, above all, ever thought of writing a book with some such name as—“Autobiography of a Phoenix,” or “People I have seen, by a phoenix.” The simurg knew all languages, why should not the phoenix have acquaintance with one? The editor of the precious manuscript might profess to have found it in Arabia, and should preface it with a treatise on vowel-points, occasioned by some of the splutters of the pen in the claw of a bird who had not time for more than six lessons; this would attract the learned—and then for the people. Let the satire of the phoenix be more charitable than Swift’s, more cleanly than Sterne’s, and more intelligible than Jean Paul’s. Let the bird start with a couple of verses which he declares he heard Juvenal repeating alone to himself, as he was writing his satires,—

Quid quid agunt homines, votum, timor, ira, voluptas,
Gaudia, discursus, nostri est farrago libelli.

While thus comprehensive in his plan, wide in his survey of human strife and folly, at Alexandria, at Rome, and haply a little nearer home, let not the said editor of these ornithological memoirs forget his finest scope for satire. He must make the phoenix judge of men in some respects, as men in their wisdom, will sometimes judge of God. Let the bird be sagacious enough in many of his criticisms, but, as he only judges from his own *bird-consciousness*, (!) let him, time after time, be seen at fault in estimating man’s higher nature and in judging of human motives. His criticism on the birds of Aristophane would be invaluable—the scholiasts must hide their diminished heads. What an excursus we should have on Nephelococcygia! But as our bird judges all things from an ornithological stand-point (as a German would say,) and measures man by an *a priori* reasoning out of the air, so would he often be egregiously wrong. Not less so, however, than men, when they judge of the Divine Being by their own preconceived notions of what he ought to be, and what he ought to do. A lower nature must always misjudge a higher—a mean man a generous, a child a father, an animal a man, a man God,—if the judgment goes on data which are exclusively *ab intra*. Those who reject revelation on such grounds, are like the satyr who turned the man out of doors because he could not understand how he could blow hot to warm his fingers, and cold to cool his porridge.

Had the phoenix been hanging in the air, his broad and gorgeous wings spread out but a little way under the hurrying clouds that were scudding across the face of the moon; and, from that eminence beloved of bird-kind, gazed on Königsberg in quest of material for another chapter of his memoirs—he would have seen what must have appeared to him like a gigantic and phosphorescent centipede, or a huge serpent, with back and crest starred with fire, moving along the winding streets toward

the centre of the town. Had the phoenix been so employed, we say, on the evening on which Roger and Arnim arrived at their journey's end and entered Königsberg, he would have seen this strange sight. If we were Emerson, we should, having achieved this sentence, continue as follows.

Mark, O reader! the unfathomable profundity of that *had*. That aspirate is a breath from the over-soul. It is a scintillation of the perennial fire. That, the philosopher, the true Gheber, worships. On such contingency hang all combinations of event. On that hinge turn the brazen gates of destiny. I repeat it, therefore, *had* the phoenix been there on *that* evening, on no other could the twin factors of that circumstance have been present to be incarnated in fact. A third arches over all antitheses. A third—the royal rainbow of elemental thought—links the coupled terms of every actual enthymeme. That third is God. Creeds call it providence. Call it rather union. Foolish people say of a great event—behold a judgment, or a miracle. To the clouded eye of the many, such things appear an interruption. To the cleared vision of the seer, they are unity. Here, Plotinus, Porphyry, Jamblichus, Proclus, Paraulsus, Behmen, Swedenborg, shake hands across the Alps of time in the pure air of intuition. Events are locks in the limitless canal that lets humanity down into the fertile plain, the sown and planted Campagna, of the Futuro. Floodgates close. Floodgates open. Genius is as a sluice. Its generalizing thoughts come with a thrill. The hand of the Infinite is turning the cogs.—There is a grating sound. Humanity is weak. Man is more than seems. The waters rush.—In the steep sides they swirl, they leap. Genius is king. The apotheosis is accomplished. Thus is the one the focus of the manifold, and the manifold a playing pencil of rags, lambent, luminous; life and light starting on its course from the nascent, central unity. Thus I find time and space but inverse measures of the soul!

Write in this fashion, and you will presently get credit for possessing a mind "that speaketh from the everlasting deeps." You will be hailed as a man of speculative power, a true seeker, and may even attain, in your own person to that union of opposite reputations which it has been reserved for the present age to combine—namely, the fame of sceptic and of prophet at the same time.

Pope, in his art of sinking in poetry, divides authors into different classes, as they resemble animals of various kinds. He would have placed Emerson among the eels, who, he says, are "obscure authors, that wrap themselves up in their own mind, but are mighty nimble and pert." To be thought profound, and to acquire "the genuine and perfect Bathos," takes some simple principle or fact which any man, bent only on saying what he has to say, as clearly and briefly as may be, would despatch in a sentence,—invert the obvious and unaffected mode of speech, give it a paradoxical air by a judicious use of antithesis and incongruous combination,—and, behold, obedient to your hand, there rises up a grand original idea, as it seems, and you are dubbed philosopher on the spot by the bewildered and admiring public. To take one of Pope's examples,—those ingenious verses on a lady drinking the Bath-waters,—some master of the profound described it thus:

"She drinks! She drinks! Behold the matchless dame!
To her 'tis water, but to us 'tis flame:
Thus, fire is water, water, fire by turns,
And the same stream at once both cools and burns!

Who would have imagined that this was the description of so simple and ordinary an act. But here you see the power of high art. It is thus with morals as well as description. Put a simple ethical truism into language similarly conceited and high-flown, and only the few will know it again. You may parade it before the half-educated as your discovery.

After this affectionate counsel to all aspirants—and who knows how many may be raised to the pedestal of fame, by following out these easy hints—we may resume our narrative.

That bright moving thing, like a fiery snake, which the "secular bird" would have seen from its elevation, if there to see anything, was nothing more or less than a torch-procession, (*Fackel-Zug*) which was held that evening, in honour of an old Rationalist Professor. For a round of years had he been employed in the frigid inculcation of his frigid faith. He was seventy years old this day, and as pale and energetic as ever. His work had been dreary enough—even as that to which the snow-queen in the fairy tale sets her folk, making them carve perpetually, capitals, and columns, and cubical blocks, for leagues of tessellated pavement, out of the ice, in the forlorn and bitter Arctic world;—workmanship doomed to dissolve from time to time, (like these human systems) when the wind has changed for "the dew-dropping south," and then, after a spiritless pause, to be toilfully recommenced. But the Professor, like the northern people, knew not what he lost, and landed his Spitzbergen as though it had been the Bay of Baid.

Through street after street went the procession, and after it, through the multitude as well as they could, went our two friends on their tired horses. It was an irritating hindrance to the impatience of Roger, but like all who have a touch of the poetical in their nature, he was gentle and considerate, and he would not risk hurting a child even to be sooner with Louise. A small troop of students who possessed, or had hired for the occasion, a plain dark-blue uniform, led the way, with their colours in their caps, with white gauntlets and drawn swords. The long train of students walked two and two, each carrying his torch, and wearing his coat inside out, that it might not be spoiled by the dropping pitch. Thus attired, they had a strange and savage appearance, almost as though clad in the skins of beasts, as they moved on by the uncertain light and under the smoke of their torches. The usual display of compliment had taken place before the house of the happy Professor,—a whole park of oratory had been discharged, and much said, as in England, about what did equal credit to peoples' heads and to their hearts:—he and his friends were to make a jubilee night of it; and, as for the students,—trust them for that—what carousing, what initiation of Foxes, what songs about Fatherland, what renouncing, what *Dummer Junges*, and challenges thereon,—would take place that night! But these were pleasures in prospect—the procession must first gather and disperse in the marketplace, according to custom.

The house in which Dr. Heinrichs resided, was situated at the corner

of a small street, where it opened on the market-place. Roger succeeded in working his way towards the point. The whole body of students formed into a great circle in the open space, and the ring was enlarged, as it were by successive coils, as the last of the train kept coming up. Then all the torches were thrown into a burning heap in the centre, casting a ruddy glow on the surrounding figures, and lighting here and there the projections of the old church tower, which looked from its misty height grimly down upon the scene. At the same time all their voices joined in singing, to a stately and somewhat solemn tune, the favorite song—

Gaudeamus igitur, Juvenes dum sumus.

Interesting as this spectacle would have been to Roger at any other time, his chief anxiety now was to approach as nearly as possible the well-known corner house. As the last words of the song were dying away, he had reached the turning,—another moment, and he would have leaped from his horse and mounted the steps—when he heard what sounded like a cry of distress, at some distance along the narrow street, and then the rapid rattle of carriage wheels over the stones. At the same instant he saw Heinrichs hurry, with a distracted air, out at the street-door, and heard him cry “where is she?” Shouting to Arnim to follow, Roger dashed at full speed up the street—which was dark and deserted, for every one was in the market-place, or at the window overlooking it—and pursued the lessening sound of the wheels. Arnim, the moment before, had been exchanging enquiries and compliments with a brother-student, who had already left the rest, and had arrived at that spot on his way to the Stadt Hamburg—the inn at which his club or corporation were to assemble and make merry. “Allow me” cried Arnim, and, in an instant, he had snatched his sword from the hand of the astonished student and was galloping after his friend.

The pursuit was a long one, for the horses of the pursuers were jaded, but at length, at the entrance of a long chaussée on the outskirts of the town, they saw the carriage. Arnim, the better mounted of the two, was the first to overtake it. He seized the head of the horse near him, accompanying it for a little, while endeavouring to lessen its speed. Roger coming up, did the same thing on the other side; and despite the threats and whip of the coachman, the horses were brought to a stand, and the traces cut, within a couple of minutes. Roger tore open the door, and caught a sight of a female figure lying back, apparently unconscious, on the seat, as a strong-built fellow who looked a somewhat between a peasant and a bravo, sprang out upon him; he was followed by a second, in a shabby uniform, with a sword in his hand. Arnim instantly crossed swords with the latter; the other, with the coachman, confronted Roger.

“Who are you sir? What means this?” said Roger’s opponent, in a voice of thunder, and producing a pistol. While he was speaking, the coachman was preparing to act, and aimed with all his strength a desperate blow at Roger. But the Englishman had not been at school in vain, and showed himself well able to sustain the credit of his countrymen in this kind of engagement. He stepped quickly aside, put out his left foot, and as his antagonist passed on, carried away by the violence of

his intended stroke, dealt him a blow just above the ear, which sent him senseless to the ground, to plough the dust with bleeding nose and temple. The other, expecting to see Roger laid prostrate by the meditated blow, had not yet fired, and before he had recovered from his surprise, Roger struck up the arm which held the pistol with his left hand, so that the piece went off in the air, and with his right, fairly doubled up his man by a tremendous blow in, what is technically termed, "the wind." It needed only another stroke to lay the luckless and agonized combatant beside his comrade. All this took place within a few seconds; and, almost immediately after, the antagonist of Arnim fell, pierced by a thrust through the shoulder. The wound was—as Mercutio said—"not so deep as a well, nor so wide as a church door,"—it was not indeed mortal, but it "served," it was "enough."

"Now for the occupant of the carriage,"—it was Louise. They brought her out, and the cool night air and the voice of Roger gradually restored her. She looked wildly about, and then clung with trembling, unuttered thanks to her lover. In a short time she declared herself able to walk back. Von Arnim mounted his own horse and led the other, walking slowly by the side of Roger and Louise.

"Had you not better ride off for a doctor to see your wounded man, and also to quiet the alarm of Dr. Heinrichs?" asked Roger.

"Doctor!" answered Arnim, with a laugh. "Let Herr Teufel fetch his own, I say. He who sent them may carry them off again. But you may be certain that they have accomplices, or that the originators of the plot are near to watch its issue. You might lose your prize again, if you walked home alone in the dark. I have the rascal's pistol, and have taken the liberty to load it with his ammunition—a pretty piece of workmanship it is too—look at that silver-work—not his own I'm sure."

Roger and Louise conversed in an under tone on the danger they had escaped. She told him that, while the family were all at the windows, she had been called away by the servant, who said that some one at the back-door wanted to speak with her. Could it be a messenger from Roger, she thought,—was he ill? The servant had gone into another room to get supper ready, she herself hastened down alone, and had scarcely asked the man what he wanted, when he threw a sort of cloak over her head, pressed it tight, and with the help of another, forced her into a carriage. She struggled violently, extricated her head for a moment, uttered a scream, and after that she remembered no more.

This was the danger of which Heinrichs had mentioned his apprehension in his letter to Roger. To tell the reader who they were, who laid the plot, and for whom the fairest maiden in Königsberg was to be carried off, must be the office of another chapter.

There is but one thing more we are called upon to explain in this place—viz.: the mode of Arnim's victory. Alas that so often in novels and romances heroes should be made to conquer every time, as though by magic, and the chronicler of the combat never vouchsafe a word as to the manner in which the feat was accomplished. Now, has not this negligence or inability, reader, often shaken your faith, made far too large a demand upon your credulity? Nothing, in such cases, should be taken for granted or come to pass as a matter of course. A day or two after

this event, when Roger was at the lodgings of his friend, the latter took down a pair of foils and said, "now I will show you how I settled our adversary the other day. He looked like a broken-down gamester, the sort of fellow to let himself out to hire for any villainous job well-paid. He saw I was a student, and knowing that in our duels we only cut, thought I should be innocent of thrusts and small-sword. Not so,—thanks to that little Creole who gave me so many lessons—I must introduce you to him some day,—such a springy piece of wire, and he rolls his eyes, and stamps, and cries ha! in a way enough to unnerve the best of the uninitiated."

"Look here: it was so. Stand on your defence. No great things that—however, it will do. After a few feints and passes, very prettily made on both sides, I will say, he made a thrust in tierce. I was waiting for that. Instead of parrying it by a slight movement of my wrist towards the right, and making a return lunge in carte as he expected, I raised my hand towards my head, with the point of my sword directed downwards on the left,—say 45°—then his blade passed out over my sword in the air—my sword was under his, mind—so I was able to make a thrust in carte instantly which would have sufficed for him, if he had not drawn back like lightning and parried it,—but the spring back made him parry too violently—and then, for me, it was but describing a semi-circle with my sword-point under his wrist, and I thrust at him in tierce—he never looked for another so quick—and that he did *not* parry. I could have killed him on the spot, but I thought a wound a little higher would serve my purpose, and leave him time to repent."

Roger expressed his wish to take a lesson or two with the foils, and promised to reciprocate with the gloves.

"The small-sword," said Arnim, "affords the most graceful practice in the world, it improves the carriage, quickens the eye, and strengthens the wrist. You never know what use it may be to you. Strange to say—and yet what harm?—we number our best fencers here among the students of theology."

Our conscience is now somewhat at rest. Nothing requiring explanation has been left unexplained. You are not called on to believe anything either improbable or impossible. The credibility of this narrative would have been lamentably impaired, had this rationale of so important an encounter been omitted, and a leading event left unaccounted for.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN NATURE.

The Nature of Man as Spiritual, Immortal, and Responsible, will be the most frequent topic of this department: though sometimes we shall introduce MISCELLANEOUS Subjects.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF AN ATHEIST.*

THE phenomenon of a trial for Atheism by a Jury, in a court of law, instead of in the court of reason, occurred about nine years ago, but has lately been presented to the public with more matured thoughts and comments of the persecuted Atheist.

We have already expressed in a few words (see the *criticism* in our last number,) our views of this transaction; that it was an unchristian procedure, carried out with needless severity, and mistakenly set down (by the Author of this account) to the credit of Christianity. We then enquired of him or his friends, and here repeat the request—whether they would favour us with any facts or principles or injunctions in the records of Christianity justifying this method of legal enforcement of opinions.

Leaving this question for the present, we shall endeavour to lay before our readers, some of the main points of this “history,” from which without the aid of enlarged comments) they will learn that this is a page in the history of “Statesmen’s Religion,” and has no connexion with the religion of Jesus.

And we confidently anticipate that the Author himself will see some reasons for revising many of his observations, as well as for a candid examination of his mental history, as to *how far his opinions have been influenced by feelings*,—whether his rejection of Christianity, and even the doctrine of a Divine Being, has not been hastened and intensified by the conduct of those who, in the name of God and Christianity, have dishonoured both.

But to enter upon this narrative, Mr. Holyoake, with others, was engaged as Socialist Missionary and Lecturer:—“A fellow missionary, Mr. Charles Southwell, had, in conjunction with Mr. Chilton, and Mr. Field, set up an Atheistical periodical in Bristol, entitled the *Oracle of Reason*—which the authorities attempting forcibly to put down, Mr. Southwell was sentenced to twelve months’ imprisonment in Bristol Gaol. On a visit to him I walked ninety miles from Birmingham to Bristol,

* The History of the last trial by Jury for Atheism in England: a fragment of Autobiography. By George Jacob HOLYOAKE. London: James Watson.

and as my way lay through Cheltenham, I staid a night in that town to deliver a lecture on 'Home Colonization as a means of superseding Poor Laws and Emigration.' At the conclusion of the lecture, I instructed the chairman to make the announcement, which I still make after my lectures, viz., that any of the audience may put relevant questions or offer what objections they consider useful—whereupon a person stood up, of the name of Maitland, a teetotaler, and sort of local preacher, and complained that 'though I had told them their duty to man, I had not told them of their duty to God,' and enquired, 'whether we should have churches and chapels in community?'

"I answered thus: 'I do not desire to have religion mixed up with an economical and secular subject, but as Mr. Maitland has introduced questions in reference to religion I will answer him frankly. Our national debt already hangs like a mill stone round the poor man's neck, and our National Church and general religious institutions cost us, upon accredited computation, about twenty millions annually. Worship being thus expensive, I appeal to your heads and your pockets, whether we are not too poor to have a God? If poor men cost the State as much, they would be put like officers on half-pay, and while our distress lasts, I think it would be wise to do the same thing with the Deity. Thus far I object, as a matter of political economy, to build chapels in communities. If others want them they have themselves to please, but I, not being religious, cannot propose them. Morality I regard, but I do not believe there is such a thing as a God.* The pulpit says 'Search the Scriptures,' and they who are thus trepanned get imprisoned in Bristol Gaol, like my friend Mr. Southwell. For myself, I flee the Bible as a viper, and revolt at the touch of a Christian.

"Perhaps this reply *was indecorous*, but it was nothing more."

This "indecorous" speech gave rise to an equally indecorous prosecution.

The proper answer to the speech would have been to shew that it was rather an objection to endowing a sect with large national funds, than any proof that we could not afford to have a God, and that therefore the allusion to the Deity might have been spared, without any violation of decency. For he is served only with "a willing mind," "not grudgingly nor of necessity; for God loveth a *cheerful giver*."—(2 Cor. ix. 7.)

And therefore since even our Author allows "others to please themselves," if they "want chapels," he should not have put down as objectionable items "general religious institutions," in addition to the National Church; since these institutions are willingly supported by those who "want them."

The speech then, is more than "indecorous," it was unfair and illogical.

Whatever system of opinions our Author may finally adopt, or his companions introduce into "community," there will, we suppose, be a necessity for teachers, who must consequently be supported, though it is quite possible the Deity will not then be upbraided for the expense.

* I do not remember using this phrase, but as the witnesses reported it, perhaps it was so: but I still incline to the opinion that it was an expression they fell upon in stating their impressions of the meeting to their employers, and all working in one office, they fell into one story, either through inadvertance or from precaution.

And of this we are sure, that if we can afford to live without God, he can manage without us: "God that made the worlds and all things therein," is not "worshipped with men's hands as though he needed anything, seeing he giveth to all life and breath and all things."—(Acts xvii. 24, 25.) None of the money collected for religion, makes him the richer; it is not paid into any bank as a fund for the relief of the Almighty: he is not enriched by our gifts, nor impoverished by our withholding; our goodness extendeth not to him, but only to his creatures, as in distant imitation of his providence, we become the almoners of his bounty: and he condescends to regard our usefulness to men, as a service done unto him, when that service is rendered from right motives.

Nor is any alteration made in this principle when "all judgment is committed unto the Son;" for "when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all his holy angels with him"—"then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: then shall he answer them, saying, verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me."—(Matt. xxvi. 34—45.)

Thus is the Redeemer served with men's hands, as men administer to the necessities (spiritual and bodily) of their fellow-men. All the good we do to men, by spreading truth, extending liberty, relieving poverty, is set down as done to Christ; all that we refrain from thus doing, is defrauding and despising him; therefore, to put the Deity on half-pay, is to shut up the bowels of our compassion, and become deaf to the woes and necessities of the human race.

To give up religion because of its expense, is to give up charity, to abandon all forms of real benevolence.

And since instruction is one of the highest benefits we can bestow upon mankind, this benevolence is not ill directed when advanced for the support of those whose life is devoted to reading, meditation and teaching; for though they may teach religion (to which the Atheist objects) he cannot consistently *object to the liberty* of doing this; and the honesty of living by it; at least in that form which God sanctions in Christianity, and for which our Author contends,—namely, the *voluntary principle*.

So that the answer of our Author, was not only indecorous, but entirely beside the mark, since they could have religion in community without State burdens; by simply leaving religion as its founder left it,—to support itself, by the willing contributions of those who experience its power and feel its value.

Nor will an impartial judge see any difference on the score of economy between supporting missionaries of the Cross, and missionaries of Socialism: the right of the Socialist parson is defended by Mr. Holyoake, in the following part of his experience as a travelling preacher.

"My next location was in a northern manufacturing town, where I was treated like its iron-ware—case-hardened. My salary there of 30s. per week was a subject of frequent discussion by the members of the Branch. For this sum, I taught a Day School and lectured on Sunday. And as he who lives the life of a child all the week (as he must do who teaches children to any purpose) finds it hard to live that of a man on Sunday, my duties were wearying and perplexing. Those who

grudged my salary made no sufficient allowance for that application necessary for the discharge of my duties—an application which often commenced long before they were up in the morning, and continued long after their mechanical employment was over at night. Not comprehending myself, at that time, that they who work for the improvement of others, must not calculate on their appreciation as an encouragement, but as a *result*, I was thrown into that unpleasant state in which my pride incited me to stop and my duty to go on. It was not till subsequent to my return from Glasgow, four years afterwards, that I mastered the problem thus raised, which so many have been ruined in solving. Though an anti-priest, my treatment was that of a priest. *My congregation, as is the case with most Freethinkers, objected to the pay of the priest, when the true quarrel was with error, and not with payment:* for if a man has the truth, it is well that it should be his interest to hold it. But Dissent, objecting to the pay of others, has been left without pay itself—hence its apostles have been reduced to fight the lowest battles of animal wants, when they should have been fighting for the truth. Dissent has too often paid its advocates the bad compliment of supposing, that if placed within the reach of competence, they would either fall into indolence or hypocrisy. It has acted practically upon the hypothesis, that the only possible way of ensuring their zeal and sincerity, was to starve them—a policy which leaves progress to the mercy of accident. For a long period the operation of this policy chilled me. *My initiation into affairs of progress was in company with men who estimated, above all other virtues, the virtue which worked for nothing.* They would denounce the patriotism of that man who accepted a shilling for making a speech, although it had cost him more to compose it than those who heard it would probably give to save their country. *Nine-tenths of the best public men and women I have known, have turned back at this point.* Not any new conviction—not any bribe of the enemy, but the natural though unwise revolt against being considered mendicants, has forced them back into supineness, indifference, or even into the very ranks of oppression. True, I felt that *he who labours with his brains is worthy of his hire, as well as he who labours with his hands.* As often as I read a book or heard a lecture, which threw new light on the paths of life, I found that it not only relieved me from the dominion of ignorance, but imparted to me the strength of intelligence. I felt indebted to the author and speaker, for I found that knowledge is not only *power*, but *property*. I knew all this, *but painful years passed over me before I acquired the courage to offer what instruction I had to impart as an article of commercial value.*"

This is nothing but a principle of Christianity, applied to another system, "even so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel."—(1 Cor. ix. 14.)

Mr. Holyoake's congregation, only imitated his own fallacy, as recorded in his reply to Maitland, since they "as is the case with most Freethinkers, objected to pay the priest, when the true quarrel was with error, not with payment."

Nor does the account he gives in that passage, say much for the strength of the Socialist principle, either in scholars or teachers; for the

scholars liked a God that cost nothing, and nine out of ten of the teachers gave up the God because he did not pay enough in hard cash!

Are these the men that are to turn the world upside down? No! The men to do this, are such as have a hold on higher principles; who find their strength in "enduring as seeing him who is invisible; who can "rejoice in tribulation," and be thankful "that they are counted worthy to suffer" in the name of the Lord!

These are not amongst Mr. Holyoake's present acquaintances; "*nine-tenths of THE BEST public men and women I have known, have turned back at this point.*"

Yet this point of suffering, of self-sacrificing endurance, was the very *starting point* of the Apostles of our Lord; they were forewarned to "sit down and count the cost," and be prepared to give up all; being thus armed,—“be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do.”

The legacy they received, was not a rich endowment, nor the power nor right to persecute, but this assurance, “if they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you;” “if the world hate you, ye know that it hated me, before it hated you:” thus were they not to be above their Lord.

Did “nine-tenths of the best of them turn back at *this point*”—“they shall put you out of the synagogues; yea the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think he doeth God service.”—(John xvi. 1.)

Yet many have braved these dangers, and rejoiced in prison, at the scaffold and the stake; and thousands now are ready to do the same; whilst numbers willingly adhere to their chosen posts of duty, abandoning the open paths to more lucrative and honourable positions. Not so with nine-tenths of the best “apostles of Free thought.” Mr. Holyoake suffered partly to wipe of this stain; for “the credit of his cause.”

But we must proceed with our narrative, to examine the way of answering Atheism adopted by the legal defenders of the glory of God and the peace of her Majesty. Finding from the local papers that his answer to Maitland had excited much wrath, and threatenings of appeals to the law, he returned to Cheltenham to lecture again in self defence; amongst his audience, “superintendent Russell with about a dozen men” appeared as the Jury, and at the end of his speech, apprehended him without a warrant.

“On the morning after my apprehension I was taken before the Rev. Dr. Newell, R. Capper, and J. Overbury, Esqrs., magistrates of Cheltenham. The Rev. Dr. Newell ought to have had the pride, if not the decency, to have kept away.”

“Mr. Bubb a local solicitor” preferred the charge of blasphemy, taking his stand, not on the law of God; not on the written law of Christianity, but “*on the unwritten law of the land.*”

Holyoake was *refuted* by the above three magistrates in a syllogism bearing the form of a committal to jail, headed “Gloucestershire to wit,” which proved that there was very little wit in the shire, or that it was not available for this occasion.

The “bail” he offered being refused, he was taken back to the station, where the surgeon of the police, (who had mistaken his office for that of chaplain) observed to Mr. Holyoake as the climax of a killing argument,

—"I am only sorry the day is gone by when we could send you and Owen of Lanark, to the stake, instead of to Gloucester jail."

But in the absence of the stake, a pair of iron hand-cuffs were put on the prisoner, in which persuasive condition he was paraded through Cheltenham, and would have been marched thus all the way to Gloucester, but for the interposition of friends who had the liberty to pay the fare for the prisoner and two policemen.

After a fortnight's imprisonment he obtained sufficient bail till the trial, which by some means was transferred from the sessions to the assizes.

THE TRIAL came on, August 15, 1842, before Mr. Justice Erskine. "On the morning of the trial the court-house at Gloucester was very crowded. Many ladies were present from all parts of the county: the wives of clergymen, and some of the nobility, were among them, attracted by curiosity, and by the opportunity which might never occur to them again of hearing, without loss of caste, a little heresy defended in person. The audience continued undiminished till ten o'clock at night."

"As the name of George Jacob Holyoake was called, he advanced and entered the dock. Mr. Ogden the turnkey in charge of prisoners, directed him with the usual air of official impatience to take his place at the bar."

"Mr. Holyoake. Do not be in a hurry. First hand me my books."

"Mr. Ogden. (Looking indignantly at a large corded box lying outside the dock.) You can't have that box here. You must go to the bar and plead."

"Mr. Holyoake. Nonsense. Hand me the box."

"It being reluctantly handed up, Mr. Holyoake applied to the judge, Mr. Justice Erskine, for the use of a table."

"Mr. Justice Erskine. There is one. (He referred to some boarding behind the bar, and there Mr. Holyoake proceeded to arrange his books and papers—although the situation was not advantageous, it being lower than the bar where the prisoners usually stand. Mr. Holyoake employed twenty minutes in this operation, and when he had done, the dock resembled a young bookseller's stall. Mr. Holyoake then advanced to the bar and bowed to the court.")

"Mr. Justice Erskine, (who had waited with great patience.) Are you ready?"

"Mr. Holyoake replied affirmatively, and the clerk proceeded to read the indictment as follows:—

[GLOUCESTER TO WIT.]—The jurors for our lady the Queen, upon their oath, present that George Jacob Holyoake, late of the parish of Cheltenham, in the county of Gloucester, labourer,* being a wicked, malicious, and evil-disposed person, and disregarding the laws and religion of the realm, and wickedly and profanely devising and intending to bring Almighty God, the Holy Scriptures, and the Christian religion, into disbelief and contempt among the people of this kingdom, on the twenty-fourth day of May, in the fifth year of the reign of our lady the Queen, *with force and arms*, at the parish aforesaid, in the county aforesaid, in the presence and hearing of divers liege subjects of our said lady the Queen, maliciously, unlawfully, and wickedly did compose, speak, utter, pronounce, and publish with a loud voice, of and concerning Almighty God, the Holy Scriptures, and the Christian religion, these words following, that is to say, 'I (meaning the said George Jacob Holyoake) do not believe there is such a thing as a God; I (meaning the said George Jacob Holyoake) would have the Deity served as they (meaning the

* It was pure invention that described me as a "labourer." It was a term of degradation in the county, and therefore employed—my profession was that of a Mathematical Teacher.

(Government of this kingdom) serve the subaltern, place him (meaning Almighty God) on half-pay—to the high displeasure of Almighty God, to the great scandal and reproach of the Christian religion, in open violation of the laws of this kingdom, to the evil example of all others in the like case offending, and *against the peace of our lady the Queen, her crown and dignity.*

“Mr. Holyoake pleaded *Not Guilty*, and applied to have the names of the jury called over singly and distinctly.”

The proper strength of Mr. Holyoake's defence, lay not in defending his sentiments, (though to some extent this was attempted) but in demanding freedom of expression, and pointing out the disgraceful position in which religion was placed, by this appeal to the force of law.

After certain preliminaries he proceeded :—

“Gentlemen of the Jury, it now becomes my duty to address you on the nature of the charge preferred against me, and of the evidence by which it is attempted to be supported. When I stood in this court a week ago, and saw the grand jury with Mr. Grantley Berkely at their head as foreman—when I heard his lordship, surrounded by learned counsel, deliver his charge in the midst of persons distinguished for learning, for eloquence, for experience, and for literary attainments—I then thought, as I now do, *that this court could find nobler means than the employment of brute force to counteract anything I could attempt—which I never have done—to bring the truly sacred into contempt.* I thought I never should be called upon to stand in this dock, with all its polluting and disgusting associations, to answer for mere matters of speculative opinion. I did think that such persons possessed a sense of the powers of the human mind that *would have prevented the interposition of penal judges upon such subjects.*”

Every right thinking man, whilst deploring the fearful errors of the accused, will agree with the principles here adduced; and blush to find the gospel exposed to such disgrace.

Nor will they fail to sympathize with feelings of shame and indignation, as they read the account given to the jury of the previous treatment the prisoner had received.

“After I was taken from the magistrates' office, I was treated with contumely at the police-station. Surgeon Pinching, finding me completely in his power, said he was sorry the days were gone by when I could hold up my head, and wished the inquisition could be put in force against such persons as myself. I was thrust into a filthy cell, and my hands were bolted together and the skin pinched off. I was brought to Gloucester on a sultry day, and should have been made to walk had not some friends interfered and obtained permission for me to ride, on paying my own fare and that of two policemen. There was no indication from my manner that I wished to make my escape, and the company of two policemen was sufficient to prevent it. It was thought if I was chained like a felon and dragged through two towns, it would wound my feelings. *If these are the ways in which the truths of Christianity are to be taught, I leave you to judge of them.*”

But these are not the methods which Christianity approves of; they are the wounds Christ has received in the house of false friends.

We will conclude for the present, with one other extract, which casts

a lasting stigma upon the Church of England; and to which we may attribute the beginnings of Mr. Holyoake's misgivings about religion: we only wonder that he cannot (though brought up in a Dissenting Sunday School) distinguish between such conduct and Christianity.

If however men will identify the Redeemer with all that is done under the cloak of religion, it is only a wonder we have not more Infidels.

Who can read the following touching appeal without feelings of bitterness and sorrow. It happened under the incumbency of one whose memory is cherished and applauded, as a godly, *evangelical* rector, "the Catholic hearted" Mr. Moseley!

"During one of those commercial panics, which a few years ago passed over this country like a pestilence, my parents were suddenly reduced from a state of comparative affluence to one of privation. At one of these seasons my little sister became ill. While she was so the Rev. Mr. Moseley, M. A., rector of St. Martin's, Birmingham, sent an order to us for his Easter due of fourpence. On previous occasions this demand had been cheerfully and promptly paid; but now, small as the sum was, it was sufficient materially to diminish the few comforts our house of illness unfortunately afforded; and it was therefore discussed whether the demand of the clergyman should be paid, or whether it should be expended in the purchase of some little comforts for my sick sister. Humanity decided; and we all agreed that it should be devoted to this latter purpose. It was; but, I think, the very next week, a summons came for the Easter due, and two shillings and sixpence were added, because of the non-payment of the fourpence. The payment of this could now no longer be evaded, for in a few days a warrant of distraint would have rudely torn the bed from under her, as had been the case with a near neighbour. Dreading this, and trembling at the apprehension; we gathered together all the money we had, and which was being saved to purchase a little wine to moisten the parched lips of my dying sister, for at this time her end seemed approaching. My mother, with a heavy heart, left home to go to the public office. The aisles there were cold and cheerless like the outside this court, and there, all broken in health and spirits, worn out with watching, and distracted by that anxiety for her child a parent, under such circumstances, only could feel, she was kept from five to six hours waiting to pay the two shillings and tenpence. When she returned all was over—my sister was dead. Gentlemen, will you wonder if, after this, I doubted a little the utility of church establishments?*" and if, after the circumstances I have related, I did not think so highly of Church 'as by law established' as before, can you be surprised? Can you punish me for it? [At this point many ladies wept, and the court manifested considerable attention.""]

* I have since learned that Mr. W. J. Fox read this passage in a Sunday morning lecture on the events of the month, delivered at South-place in the September following my trial; and I take this opportunity of acknowledging that Mr. Fox was the only occupant of a pulpit from whom I received a friendly line during my entire imprisonment.

(To be continued.)

REVIEWS AND CRITICISMS.

Punctuality. By the Rev. JAMES KENDALL. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co. H. W. Walker, Leeds.

This is a curious production; no doubt in defence of a very orderly duty; its main point however is confined to the importance of being soon enough at the "Wesley chapel;" or at church, when there is no Wesleyan service; "and if you go to *dissenting chapels* be exactly in time." Thus our Author has a triple classification, churches, Wesleyan chapels, and dissenting chapels.

His work on Punctuality does not keep to the point; yet it seems nearly as bad to waste men's time by something foreign when we *have* arrived; as to waste it by keeping them waiting.

To say nothing of "Chap I. extended, preliminary, somewhat strange, no connexion with punctuality," and numerous digressions on ministers "carrying morocco hymn-books for shew," together with the importance of subordination (in inferiors) to real gentlemen, &c., we have an Appendix, to illustrate the Author's doctrine of "vanity." This Appendix consists first of an illustration respecting a young man who aspired to "breeches," which were then the exclusive property of "clergymen and *other* ministers."

This fairly introduces another heading, entitled "Annotation on the word 'breeches;'" in which, through two and a half pages, the Author vindicates the term from all "indecorum and immodesty:" he finds permission to use the word, by several quotations from the New Testament, (*where it does not occur*,) and hence he exclaims—

"O! what a glorious book is the New Testament!"

It would seem our Author has been accused of wit, and hence one great purpose of this book is to vindicate the possession and exercise of that quality.

His readiest and safest plan, would have been—to *deny the charge at once*; which he might have done with righteous indignation. Not guilty, my Lord.

"Again: this book may be thought too witty to suit the office of a Christian minister. We think not." *And so do we.* Possibly the Author is too *rude*, and hits away at some of his brethren; but if any one charges him with wit, we entirely acquit him.

"Vanity," he assures us, "though it does not amount to positive iniquity, deserves a gentle rub."

And accordingly we are informed—"I once published a pamphlet recommending a union of the Church, and the Methodists. This pamphlet was patronized by the episcopacy and royalty itself; but from fear of agitation, I *LET it go down.*" We suppose it was "all up" first.

His other publications however, he will not "let go down," since "they have been warmly commended by metropolitan reviewers;" "perhaps I have given wounds, and you may say of this book, as one of my reviewers who has eulogized my lecture on Ministerial Popularity has said, viz., &c."

"A few years ago, I published a plain sermon on 'Peevishness.' This sermon, to my great surprise, was very much eulogized by metropolitan and provincial reviewers."

We find from this volume, that our Author's chief pieces are four, three sermons or lectures, and this "Hand-book;" and all these pieces have the remarkable property of prefixing a P, viz., "Punctuality," "Popularity," "Peevishness," and "Paradise." Perhaps particular praise will be paid by those who perceive and appreciate the precise properties of this peculiar line of publication. We pretend not to be up to our Author's point.

"*But then the critics!* Well, and what about the critics? *Are you not afraid of them?* Not we, beloved. Do they resemble Aristotle and Longinus among the Greeks, or Horace and Quintilian among the Romans? If so, they are the very men we want to take notice of us. . . . These *competent* literati are just to our taste." Then we give it up; but it may be a question whether "Punctuality" would be to *their* taste.

Educational Economy: or, State Education vindicated from the votaries of voluntarism. By THOMAS EMERY. London: Arthur Hall & Co. Leicester: J. Burton.

This pamphlet is a very creditable production of a working man, the Author of several other tracts much in the same line. The writer will do well to aim at a little more simplicity and directness of style, which would increase its strength and vigour—qualities which he already possesses in a considerable degree.

We do not however agree with the principles advocated in this pamphlet, and are disposed to imagine that the Author is not sufficiently acquainted with the spirit and principles of the "votaries of voluntarism." Though he is perhaps as fully acquainted with them as writers of larger pretensions, on the same side. We should be glad to welcome Mr. Emery in some other walk of literature; though no doubt the pamphlet before us will be deservedly welcomed by such as adopt the writers views of "State education." For our parts, we think the State has done enough in this line; it has failed completely in the Universities and grammar schools; and we should be sorry to see the nation beguiled from looking into these, by the convenient charity of further taxation.

That further enlightenment is desirable for the people in general, we do not for a moment question: nor would this have been recognized by the State-educationalists, if the voluntaries had not already introduced so much light as to render their darkness visible. And now, those who within the memory of man, obstructed the voluntaries, saying that the poor could do as their fathers,—without learning—flock around others who have not been very notorious for practical efforts, to say that voluntarism has failed, (though it has done all that has been done,) and must yield the crown to Statism, whilst it quietly gives up the ghost in shame, penitence, and derision.

It will not quit the field so easily; and even should it be discouraged still more, by the cheap competition of those who tax the voluntaries in order to out-do them, it will still remain to put galvanism into State machinery, and preserve it in something like active usefulness from fear of rivalry.

We do not profess here to enter formally into the question, and therefore shall reserve our general enquiry for some early opportunity: but we may at least guard our readers against one common fallacy,—that when every man can *demand* education for his children, as a *legal right*, he will feel independent, and not be the mere object of a degrading charity.

Is it indeed so? Do men *now* feel that it is so very ennobling and independent, when from necessity they seek *the legal right of parish relief*?

What then will give such dignity to a parish education? We have long had "independent electors," and now we are to have an independent pauperism, in the higher question of education itself.

We hope, on a future occasion, to examine the force of the arguments on this subject contained in Mr. Emery's pamphlet; meanwhile, we would suggest to him whether it be *really a commendation*, though no doubt so intended, by a local journal, that "his blows fall the heaviest on the weakest places: this would really be a waste of blows, which should be reserved for that on which the voluntaries rely; or they will abandon the weak places, and defy all attacks as they retire to the strongholds.

The Moral Reformer, and Revival Advocate; a Monthly Magazine of Progress for the People. London: George Berger, Holywell Street, Strand. Lincoln: R. Bulman.

We intended noticing this cheap and useful periodical earlier; it is highly deserving of public support, being written in a deeply religious spirit, in a simple and earnest style, and sold at the trifling cost of one penny.

We cordially recommend it to Sunday School teachers, scholars, and the young generally.

I.

CHRIST'S RELIGION.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD." 1 Thess. v. 12.

THE TRUE APOSTLES' CREED;

OR, THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON OF LIFE AND DOCTRINE, IN THE PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST.

THE wisdom which cometh from above, is scarcely more illustrious in the truths contained in the Scriptures, than in the MEDIUM by which those truths are exhibited.

We refer not to the variety and beauty of illustration with which the sacred writings abound, these are sufficiently conspicuous, and have often been pointed out with discrimination, feeling, and eloquence; there is another fact of greater interest, which has not perhaps attained to equal prominence in the teachings of divines or in the meditations of Christians; namely, that JESUS CHRIST OUR REDEEMER IS A PERSONIFICATION OR EMBODIMENT OF EVERY TRUTH *relating to the life that now is, and the life that is to come.*

In the Saviour we are to find our canon or rule both of conduct and of faith: insomuch that any deviation from holiness of life or truth of religious opinions, is to be reproved after the example of an inspired Apostle, with these pregnant and memorable words:—"but ye have not so LEARNED CHRIST, if indeed ye have heard him, and been taught by him, as THE TRUTH IS IN JESUS."—(Eph. iv. 21.)

CHRIST therefore is OUR LESSON, the grand theme for our study and meditation; that our hopes, thoughts, and lives may be consistent with what is found in him; since in regard to each of these, "the truth is in Jesus."

(1) That Jesus Christ is thus presented to us in the Scriptures, as the lesson we are to learn; (2) that there is a fitness and obvious divine wisdom in thus incarnating divine truth, so that its fulness should be familiarized to our thoughts in the person of Immanuel, dwelling with us in the living portraiture of the gospel; (3) that "the fulness of grace and truth" presented in this attractive form, meets all the spiritual wants of mankind, will we hope be fully manifest to the mind and conscience of the reader in this enquiry.

And we would earnestly pray that "the spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father," and which testified of Jesus to his Apostles, may be our guide into all the truth: according to that promise,—“howbeit when he, the Spirit of the truth is come, he will guide you into all

the truth, for *he will not speak of himself*; . . . *he shall GLORIFY ME: for he shall receive of MINE, and shall shew it unto you.*"—(John xvi. 13, 14.)

We have then first to remember, that the truth is in Jesus; that truth which the Holy Ghost was to reveal to the Apostles; who was called the "Spirit of the truth," on this very account—because his office would be *to glorify the Saviour*, by making manifest the truths that were embodied in him.

And having this fact settled in our minds, that the truth is in Jesus; we have secondly "so" to "learn Christ," as to apprehend and live upon "the gospel of God *concerning his Son.*"—(Rom. i. 1, 3.)

For the better guidance of our thoughts in this important enquiry, we propose discussing the three propositions stated above, under the following simple division.

I. (1) That the Scriptures do recognise and enforce this canon of truth and duty, or rule of faith and life, viz., Jesus as the standard of human hopes and duties: (2) and that this is a wise provision, especially adapted for the instruction and saving guidance of mankind.

II. (3) That the examination of this rule or canon of life and doctrine, will afford all needful spiritual truths: the most important of which, we shall endeavour to unfold, as comprising not only "the whole duty of man" but his creed, his hopes, and his helps.

1. We proceed therefore in the first place to prove the fact and justify the wisdom of God contained in the Scriptures, in setting forth Jesus Christ as the summary or embodiment of teaching;—the lesson we are to learn in the way of understanding and practice.

The expressions already quoted from the Epistle to the Ephesians, that we are to "learn Christ," and that "the truth is in Jesus," are very peculiar, and though often quoted or alluded to in exhortations, petitions and religious writings, are perhaps not generally scrutinized and understood.

Our familiarity with the sound of such words, is sometimes a barrier to close examination, so that they pass for what is usual, without exciting even our curiosity: but any one unaccustomed to religious subjects and phraseology, if possessed of an enquiring mind, might naturally ask on hearing such expressions—"how can truth be in Jesus, or in any individual; is not truth impartial and impersonal; altogether independent of times, places, and individuals?"

Undoubtedly many truths are thus independent; for instance truths of science, or matters of fact, exist not as embodied in or dependent on persons,—the truth of astronomy was not in Galileo or Newton, or in any philosopher of nature; but in nature itself: in the objects to which science relates.

Truths of astronomy or geology are not in the writers, but in the heavens and the earth; they who defend or explain their theories on these subjects, must refer to *matters of fact* independent of themselves as writers: the standard for themselves and their followers is to be found—not in the writers nor their books, but in the reality of nature; the facts existing in the structure of the firmament and the strata of the earth.

In other words, any theory of nature, must aim to agree with the phenomena of nature, since the true formula for science is—**THE TRUTH IS IN NATURE**: whilst on the other hand, since *Christianity is a theory of Christ*, it must be founded on **THE REALITY DISCOVERABLE IN THE REDEEMER**.

The scientific man studies nature, as the province of his science; the Christian and theologian studies Christ, as the groundwork of his hopes and principles. The proper refutation of any error in science, is—"ye have not so learned nature"—ye have not read this lesson in the standard lesson-book of God's visible works, but have missed the truth which is *there*; the reality embodied in the *object-lessons* with which the Creator has adorned the floor, the walls, and the roof of his training school.

In like manner all errors in religion, whether of life or of doctrine, are condemned and refuted by an appeal to its appropriate standard;—"ye have not so learned Christ," such principles and practices are unsupported by anything exhibited in the person, teaching, and conduct of the Redeemer; if indeed ye profess to hear him, to study that lesson, believe and live according to the pattern,—"**as the truth is in Jesus.**"

That such is the **SCRIPTURAL STANDARD**, will scarcely be denied by any who recognize the Bible as containing a Divine Revelation: yet since this fact is not made sufficiently prominent amongst those who maintain what are called evangelical sentiments; and is scarcely admitted in the teachings of those who hold the opposite views; it may be useful to remind both, of some amongst the many expressions and intimations of this standard in the New Testament.

The reality of this as the Christian standard, will be fully manifest in our subsequent enquiries; but may be briefly exhibited here to remove any preliminary objections from prejudicing the minds of any reader.

"For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God, to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God; and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."—(2 Cor. x. 4, 5.)

This military metaphor is very comprehensive and full of instruction: repudiating physical force, and the baser motives of earthly conflicts, it yet maintains the efficiency of the gospel against the strongholds or *fortifications* of political power, or physical force in all its manifestations; as well as against that other form of carnal weapons—human defences—namely the unenlightened "light of nature," the "imaginations" or subtleties of philosophy; the inventions and schemes of men; which as a "high thing" or tower erects itself in opposition to the teachings of God.

And what is the object of scaling this fortress, the stronghold of physical despotism and the tower of "man's wisdom" built thereupon? It is to conquer this two-fold force of spiritual and material encampments, and taking captive those who man them, to bring **EVERY THOUGHT** into *obedience unto Christ*, as the Lord of all human intellects and affections.

It is to subjugate the speculations of philosophy, the inventions of priesthoods to the rule of faith and practice, the divine teaching embodied in the Saviour, "**as the truth is in Jesus.**"

"The knowledge of God," against which human imaginations are erected; is explained by the Apostle in the next sentence, as the submission of every thought unto Christ, in whom God is known most clearly, and by whom the divine will respecting mankind is most fully manifested.

Thus is Christ himself our body of divinity, and embraces the whole duty of man; to know him, is to know all the truth we are concerned to know respecting our spiritual condition, duties and prospects.

It is in accordance with this fundamental rule, that Paul prays respecting the Laodiceans and others;

"That their hearts might be knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ; IN WHOM ARE HID ALL THE TREASURES OF WISDOM AND KNOWLEDGE. And this I say (that all spiritual wisdom is treasured up in Christ) lest any man should beguile you with enticing words. . . . As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him: rooted and built up in him, and established in the faith. Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ."—(Col. ii. 2—8.)

We are here plainly directed to find our wisdom in Christ, the mystery (or formerly hidden but now revealed purpose) of God respecting whom, constitutes our magazine of spiritual armoury; whence we are to find invincible weapons against the "rudiments of the world,"—"philosophy and vain deceit"—the speculations of the learned and the impositions of the priest.

The same fact is obvious from Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, where the wisdom of men is contrasted with the wisdom embodied in the Saviour. Hence the Apostle declares—"For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? where is the Scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that, in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."—(1 Cor. i. 19—24.)

Here then we find "*Christ the power and the wisdom of God*," in opposition to the strongholds and imaginations, the fortresses and theories of brute force and unsanctified "inventions:" that whereas beforehand men had relied upon schemes of political power, philosophical theories and the pomp of State priesthoods, the divine method was entirely the reverse, equipping men with inspired truth and grace from heaven, without reliance on other advantages: "that *no flesh* should glory in his presence," as though carnal weapons or human means had emancipated and sanctified the world.

And the whole argument is thus summed up,—"*but of him are ye in Christ Jesus, WHO OF GOD IS MADE UNTO US WISDOM.*"—(1 Cor. i. 30.)

These quotations and references are sufficient to establish the fact, that

the Scriptures of the New Testament do recognize this standard of religious truth, viz., that it not only relates to, but is embodied in Jesus Christ, "who of God, is made unto us wisdom;" who is divinely sanctioned as the rule of our thoughts and actions, being "full of grace and truth."

We have then briefly remarked upon two points relating to this great question; first, the *peculiarity* of such a phrase, "the truth is in Jesus;" and secondly, the *reality* of this as the Scriptural standard of life and doctrine.

We shall next proceed to illustrate by a variety of familiar instances, the *wisdom or fitness* of such a method of conveying and commending truth.

The common saying that "example is more powerful than precept," is a tribute of respect to this divine method, which conveys precept by example, and enforces both doctrine and duty by an actual historical instance. The law of God, his mercy and promises, are here drawn out in a living character, in Jesus Christ; that as the Stoics had their *ideal model*, or wise man, to which standard so shadowy and indefinite they appealed; as in the modern days, writers commend truths or falsehoods by novels, tales of invented life, in order to fascinate the imagination and win the affections of readers; so *God has taught his entire TRUTH IN THE BIOGRAPHY of his Son our Lord.*

As the Redeemer spoke his parables, to embody truth, in a historical form, giving pictures of breathing life, and animated nature; as moral tales are written for children; as Bunyan exhibited his Scriptural learning in the fascinating form of a Pilgrimage; as "history is philosophy teaching by example;" so God has in Christ favoured the world with a marvellous parable, a real pilgrimage, divine philosophy in a divine example, suited to the apprehensions of men and adapted to the scale of human life.

The wisdom of this rule may further be seen in the fact, that for all popular and practical purposes, *we require some obvious rule to which all can appeal, which all may understand and to which all should conform.**

In matters admitting of assertion and denial, belief and doubt, (if they be questions in which men in general are called upon to act) we need some land-mark, or definite point of appeal, as a recognized standard and real test of truth and right.

The rule itself must be founded upon adequate reasons, which though all persons may not be acquainted with, yet shall lie open to the examination of those who will give the subject due attention; and who may become as the *elected auditors of accounts* to such as whilst having an important stake in the concern, are too much engaged to examine all its affairs.

This is a safe business rule, and is equally safe in religion: it admits what priests assert, that all persons are not able to enter into every question in religion; but it denies and refutes what priests pretend, namely, that therefore some unquestioned infallible impostor should manage for all men; and it shews clearly, that they who cannot do all things for

* Some reason has been set up for following priests; but it is simply a reason for following Christ the Great High Priest, and only Master.

themselves, may yet be able to CHOOSE their auditor, their baker, their banker, architect, &c.

No man in the world is able to do everything for himself, even a priest must employ a tailor to make his cloak of phariseism; but he is not therefore bound to submit to the claims of some Roman tailor, the successor to that man who made Peter's "*fisher's coat*,"—(John xxi. 7).—claiming a sacred monopoly in the manufacture of Levitical garments. And because every man in the world, is thus dependent on others, there is no man left (except Robert Owen) to build and manage a universal *asylum* for these incapables, who cannot take care of their own affairs. So that the argument which makes the priest our refuge and standard in religion, would prove the insanity of mankind, including the priests themselves.

Abandoning therefore this melancholy conclusion, and setting the priest aside along with it, we may point out the advantage of an obvious standard of appeal in all practical matters.

In the ordinary transactions of business, men have *weights and measures* of various kinds suited to different articles of trade, and graduated after a fixed and definite scale: thus do we judge of the quantities or amounts of the material bought and sold.

This is the plain rule for such cases; and can be followed even by those persons who may not understand the *speculative difficulties* that might easily be raised, and would utterly confound many who yet can safely follow existing practical weights and measures.

A philosopher might enquire what is the *abstract measure* from which you start, and by which these actual weights are regulated? "Three barleycorns make one inch,"—but how long is a barleycorn, are they all of the same length, and will not the variation throw you out of your reckoning? A BUSINESS SCEPTIC might further enquire, who has measured the barleycorn and settled the length of an inch by this professed standard?

Nor is the matter more simple if we turn to the speculations respecting *weight*,—what is its final standard? Not one tradesman in a million could begin all this afresh, and without previous aids, construct a system of weights and measures for the purposes of commerce. And very few amongst them could explain the starting point in settling those which already exist: they could not tell *what to weigh the weights by*; and yet every man is able to meet all the demands of trade, by the practical standards already agreed upon. So difficult are the commonest affairs, when looked at in reference to their fundamental principles; so easy are all these affairs in their ordinary practical operations. And that which renders them so easy, is this standard to which all may appeal, the workings and applications of which all do understand: this advantage of plainness and applicability is secured to the highest wisdom in the standard of the gospel—"the truth is in Jesus."

The observations advanced respecting weights and measures, may be extended to many other subjects; such as *money and time*. The value of money is equally difficult in theory, equally easy in practice: what is the worth of a pound sterling? It may be exchanged for so many shillings; or it is worth so much weight of pure gold or silver. But what are these worth? *Just what they will fetch*; and this depends upon the

fluctuations of the markets, the abundance or scarcity of provisions. This would lead men into all intricacies of the currency question, on which our money is based, and which is understood as little as the Apocalypse, every writer on each of these subjects having a new theory, and few escaping from some peculiar hallucination which serves to terrify the majority at such dangerous studies.

But whilst there are these unsolved difficulties lying at the foundation of Mammon-worship itself, (for Mammon is a greater mystery than all else that is worshipped,) still the simplest tradesman finds pounds, shillings, and pence, a plain practical guide for all business interchanges.

The same speculative difficulties, the same practical facilities, belong to the question of *time*: it is a deep metaphysical abstraction; of which few do, if any can, form a clear idea; it is a mystery to begin with: whilst the divisions of time are not without perplexing subtleties; sixty minutes make an hour, but what makes a minute or a second? The apparent daily journey of the sun gives the first practical measure, which is divided and subdivided for the various parts; but the observation of this varies in different places of the earth, and in some, a day and night are more than twenty-four hours: notwithstanding all this, the workman, leaving these questions to the philosophers, follows contentedly and safely his own watch or the town clock.

In all these things an outward obvious standard is adopted, which suits the common convenience of mankind, and serves very well to regulate the world's business.

Men seek to be conformed to *the truth* exhibited in these marks and measures; they work by them, trade and live by them; and apart from such plain rules everything would be in utter confusion, the world would be turned upside down.

So in religion, God has not left us to abstract metaphysical speculations, respecting the beautiful, the true and the good; but has favoured us with a reality that transcends all ideals; not abstract truth, but a concrete, living reality; not philosophical speculations, but a practical rule; not truth merely in theories and general propositions respecting justice, integrity, &c., but "the truth is in Jesus," clothed in "the beauty of holiness."

Thus we are provided with that which is found so essential in other matters, a plain practical guide, in this exhibition in actual life of the great truths and duties claiming our reception and performance,—the weights and measures of our spiritual merchandize.

In the human standards thus adduced for illustration, we find that something is taken for granted by the generality of men; certain first principles are assumed; the popular guides are founded on past processes, upon the reckonings and regulations of those who have given pre-eminent attention to the more fundamental questions: and yet these previous questions are open to examination, and one main proof of the standard is also open to those who follow it, namely, in the usefulness or adaptation of the rule to answer the ends required.

And so we have in "the gospel of God concerning his Son," the results of divine wisdom, the value of which may be felt by personal experience; and whilst this rule affords us a plain and popular guide, it will also

stand the deepest and most scrutinizing examination we can bestow upon it.

The fitness of this divine rule, as giving us in the business of salvation what we use in the business of our worldly life, namely, a plain popular directory, will further be evident by a comparison with the fine arts.

In this imitative province, men first copy nature, or actual objects as their standard; but in process of time, when art has advanced, and great masters have acquired a reputation, their works instead of nature, become the object of the students' attention: art is drawn from life, and rules are drawn from art.

Hence men study the models of painting, statuary, or architecture in the most celebrated productions; seeking to attain excellencies already embodied in such works;—to attain *to the truth in these*; whereas, God in his wisdom has combined the two sources of instruction together, art and nature; presenting us with an exquisite and matchless model of *living artistry*, a speaking likeness of his own perfections adapted to our condition.

From this divine model we are to copy, and nothing is true, that does not conform to the reality and standard "*as the truth is in Jesus.*"

Such is the wisdom displayed in the adoption of such a standard,—the Redeemer, as a personal embodiment of God's mercy and man's duty,—of the hopes and responsibilities of mankind.

Thus far we have noticed the peculiarity of this rule, that the truth should be in Jesus; and proved the reality of this standard, as actually a rule of Scripture; whilst thirdly, we have endeavoured to illustrate, by various comparisons, the wisdom displayed in affording us a rule of this plain and popular nature.

We defer to a future number the *deductions* from the fact of such a standard, viz., that this is *the only* canon, standard, or test of truth,—what is to be found in the Saviour himself, &c. After which, we shall proceed to the discussion of the truths really embodied in Christ, as the perfect rule of faith and practice.

II.

PRIESTS' RELIGION.

HUMAN AUTHORITY AND INVENTION *versus* CONSCIENCE AND THE BIBLE.

The Scriptures are the only standard of Christian faith and practice: every one is at liberty to examine them; but no one is at liberty to decline this examination: and though we may receive the help of others, we may not rest on their authority, (which is man-worship;) nor receive as religion, what is not in the Scriptures, (which is will-worship.)

THE REV. GEORGE SWALLOWELL AND HIS FAMILY CONNEXIONS.

"THE REV. GEORGE SWALLOWELL was a clergyman at Houghton-le-Spring, near Durham, and was a sincere Protestant; but after a while, going to visit a Catholic who was in prison for his religion, *he was convinced, by arguments very much like those I have given you in this letter*, that the Catholic Church was the true Church:"—such are some of the words contained in the last dying speech and confession, of the Rev. "Henry Wilberforce, M.A. *late* Vicar of East Farleigh, Kent."*

As his weakened and expiring reason was just being overshadowed by the Roman extinguisher, and his soul and body about being committed to that spiritual asylum erected for the peace, safety, and protection of all such as have lost their private judgment; he ventures, poor man, even in such circumstances, with a hallucination peculiar to these unfortunates, to guide others after ceasing to guide himself.

He has now attained to security, and has, with a too literal regard to the apostolic precept, "become a fool that he may be wise;" and shut his eyes in order to see more clearly: whether "his parishioners" were blind also, and failing to obtain a guide when his eyes were open, will believe the same leader now to be infallible, because he has closed them, is a curious subject for enquiry to such as are interested in the epidemics of imitative mental and bodily suicide.

To his "dear friends, the parishioners of East Farleigh," he observes—"as I am just leaving you, what I say is in some respects like the last words of a dying man," for he must have felt that his faculties were failing, had indeed entirely failed, his light had hitherto been darkness, and now he had determined on trying wax candles.

The reasons for this step out of darkness into gloom, or darkness made visible by the ghostly apparition of holy wicks, are laid very solemnly

* Reasons for submitting to the Catholic Church, &c.

before his parishioners, in a "farewell letter;" reasons so forcible, as that in the days of Elizabeth they convinced "the Rev. George Swallowell;" who was rightly named, since his swallow must have been the most efficient part of his constitution;—a veritable "broad guage," capacious enough to receive the most enormous train that ever travelled from Oxford to Rome.

When these men open their mouths, cities should tremble, Leviathan is nothing to them; their throat is not an open Sepulchre, but a yawning earthquake, swallowing seven hills at once, together with the Vatican; St. Peter's Church, and St. Peter's chair. The whale swallowed Jonah, these men swallow the whale, and make nothing of it; they take in afterwards the blessed bark of Peter as quinine for a tonic, and next engulph the Ark of Noah itself, with all its contents of beasts, clean and unclean, as the type of the one true Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. Wilberforce is very illustrious in this line, being an M.A., a master of the art; he is one of those who heal themselves, who make and take their own *boluses*.

In his last dying speech, he prescribes and mixes up thirteen large pills, evidently intended for the Swallowell family. Each of these is intended gradually to enlarge the passage, that finally there may be room for the Church of Rome to go down as comfortably as she has descended the roomy passage of our friend Wilberforce.

He first advises his dear friends to keep down all that he has taught them, since he has nothing to retract, but only wishes to lay it on a little thicker. Therefore, as he beforehand taught them that there is a true Church, with which the Holy Ghost dwells, they have only to find this Church and swallow her whole; accordingly, he proceeds to administer, first, a series of pills containing marks of this Church, that having received these tokens, the poor patients may next receive the Lady. The whole will do them good, if they can but get them down; their throats will improve by exercise, and in time they will swallow well.

The preliminaries by which our spiritual physician introduces his pills, are indubitable marks of approaching insanity; he was pretty well lost before Rome saved him; "very far gone" indeed "from original" rectitude of understanding; and was seeking to "find out many inventions." Indeed the chief invention by which men fall from that uprightness to which God has restored us by the gospel, is the invention of a universal Church, "the mother and mistress of all the Churches,"—A MYTHOLOGICAL PERSONAGE, *that exists nowhere but in the inventive brains of monks, nuns, and other ecclesiastics.* She has never been seen, and is not half so real as the man in the moon; the great probability is, that this woman is that man's wife, and hence the peculiarities of all their children.

The commencing obfuscation of our departed friend's intellect is seen in the enquiry after this blessed woman—the true Church; when he *mistakes a man* for the person, and quotes the words of the Saviour, "if a man love me, he will keep my words, and my father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him;" whence our rambling friend concludes that there is a woman at Rome with whom the Comforter dwells, whose agents are priests, whose children are the

faithful, to which Lady we are to go, and obey her words,—though she is not mentioned by the Redeemer, and has never been discovered from that day to this.

There are thousands of poor people imposed upon by this wretched sham—holy mother Church—priests talk of her every day, and have so boldly and frequently declared that they are her agents, that many have been so woefully deceived as actually to pay large sums out of love to a person who does not exist.

The whole affair is a cunning speculation, by which the priests obtain money under false pretences.

Let the devotees of Rome ever get a glimmering of this idea, that there is no such a person as a mother Church, that it is a *convenient and lucrative* FIGURE OF SPEECH, by which the priests make merchandise in gold and in power; and this suspicion being once excited, the Roman bank would speedily break.

In vain then would the Wilberforces invoke the credulity of the Swallowells; at present however, it is this *fabulous person* or pure flam that Mr. Wilberforce is in search of; and he will per force drag in the Bible to be tortured by the Inquisition into a confession for this Roman veiled Lady, whose face has never been seen.

Whatever our Lord promised to his Apostles as such, *that* is made to be the charter of this woman; whatever he promised to his individual followers, is set down to the Church of Rome, the fraternity of ecclesiastics, who are sworn to keep up this woman of straw: and after thus abusing the Scriptures *which give no saving power to any Church, and NEVER MENTION EITHER A CATHOLIC OR ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH*, this distempered gentleman adduces his thirteen pills, thirteen marks to prove that “the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ.”

We cannot roll these under our tongue, since they are by no means “morsels,” we can only walk round them and point out their manifold attractions.

The reader will be kind enough to bear in mind, that the purpose of Mr. Wilberforce is to find even in the Scriptures, marks of a Church which the Scriptures never condescend to mention; and to prove that our religious life and Christian hopes come from *finding the Church as our safety*, whilst the writers of the New Testament never dreamed of any such sanctuary; but only pointed to the Saviour, independent of Church mediation.

So that the very enquiry after such a universal, true, and only authoritative Church, is itself a wandering of the intellects, or mental aberration, altogether a departure from the sanity of saving gospel truth; and consequently we shall not expect much wisdom in the following thirteen marks by which to recognize this ecclesiastical invention—holy mother Church.

The first mark by which we are to “know that the Roman Catholic Church is the only true Church,” is “because she is the only Church that was set up by God himself; she began eighteen hundred years ago, when our Lord sent out the Apostles to teach in his name.”

So debilitated is the memory of Mr. Wilberforce; now it happens, as all the world knows, that our Lord never sent any one to Rome, never

mentioned the name of Rome in connexion with his Church; but told his Apostles to tarry at Jerusalem, for the Holy Ghost; and at Jerusalem the first Church was formed in an upper room; whilst there were also many other Churches in Judea soon afterwards, besides a Church at Corinth, at Ephesus, and a great many other places; all which were complete Churches, and had no connexion with Rome whatever.

There were also "seven Churches in Asia:" (Rev. i.) these existed eighteen hundred years ago, but are no guides to us; they had no authority, but were true Churches only while they obeyed the New Testament gospel. The Roman priests are not that Roman Church which Paul founded; and that was not the only Church, for there were a great many others.

But if it is for age they claim the foremost and only place, Moses is a little older than the Pope, who is only a second-hand Moses and Aaron compressed into one character; a cross of "diverse kinds;" the linen of the priest and the woollen of the State, woven into a mongrel garment of pontifical pride, although directly forbidden in the Levitical Law.—(See Levit. xix. 19.)

It is therefore only the Swallowell family that can take in the astonishing blunders—that the Papal Church was formed by God, and that he founded no others eighteen hundred years ago: since he did not found this Church at all, and did found many others.

(2) The second attempt on the throats of the faithful, by one rightly called Wilberforce, (since it is all by will and force, not by reason,) is the large assertion that some texts declare that the true Church can never err, "because God the Holy Ghost is in her, and the Catholic Church says the same thing. She *says* she is infallible."

And because *she* says so,—a witness speaking in her own favour without shewing her face,—therefore we are to take it down. Unfortunately for this Apocryphal Lady, who is so very modest in her claims, the texts quoted never mention her, "He (the Spirit of truth,) shall lead *you* into all the truth;" that is, *the Apostles*, who were inspired to tell us everything about the Saviour. And to the laity it was afterwards said, "ye have an unction from the Holy One, and know all things;" that is, are instructed in all saving truth.—(1 John ii. 20, 27.)

Whilst our Lord promised his presence, not to the Roman Catholic Church, (which he never mentioned,) but wherever two or three are gathered together in my name, that is, to worship me, there am I in the midst of them.; so his promise is to the faithful, not to Roman priests. Therefore, Christ is no more in that Church than he is in the wafer, both Church and wafer are Italian confectionery, which none but the Rev. George Swallowell and family can manage to take in.

(3) Our lost friend, the "late vicar," advances to pile up a third test of our receiving powers; whose dimensions may easily be judged of, by his own description—"Again, Christ promised that the true Church should be built upon St. Peter.—(Matt. xvi. 18.) Now St. Peter was the first of the bishops of Rome, he was the first Pope. The Catholic Church now is ruled by the successors of Peter. No other sect or Church has anything to do with St. Peter."

Now Christ *did not promise to build the Church on Peter; he built*

the Church on himself; *he* is the foundation, and Peter was a *stone*, one of the stones built upon that rock. Our Lord referred to the meaning of Peter's name, which Christ himself had given, (John i. 42.) Cephas or Petros, (a stone) and "on this *petra* (or rock, *not on that Petros or stone*,) will I build my Church."—(Matt. xvi. 18.)

As much as to say, there, in you, is a stone: here, in me, is a rock; and that stone shall, together with others, be built on this rock—the Son of the living God.

For, *who ever built a house on a stone?* Now, Petros is a stone; not a rock; therefore would be very suitable to be used in the wall, but not large enough for a foundation. But CHRIST IS THE ROCK, "other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."—(1 Cor. iii. 11.) Now the Popes have Peter for a foundation, therefore they are not in Christ's Church. To receive their Peter is to swallow stones, which may satisfy the Rev. George Swallowell. But we, instead of swallowing this smooth stone out of the brook of tradition, cast it back at the Goliath of superstition and deception.

(4) A fourth trial of our ability in receiving pretences, is in the assertion that "the Catholic Church is spread over the whole world. This was one of the things promised in the Bible."

Now no such thing is promised, and no such thing has taken place. The widest Church is perhaps the synagogue of Satan, "the God of this world," and we do not doubt the Pope may be some relation, as a successor to Peter in one point, which our "late vicar" has forgotten,— "But he turned and said unto Peter, get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me; for thou savourest not of the things that be of God, but those that be of men."—(Matt. xvi. 23.)

When Christ was offered the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, (the things which Peter longed for,) he refused them, even though offered by "the Prince of this world," (Matt. vi. 1—10.) but the Pope has struck a bargain with Satan, sold himself to the Devil, and therefore may boast of his reward—the kingdoms of this world—though now his time seems up, and his master may come for him, since the kingdoms will be too hot to hold him, and too turbulent for him to hold. We therefore cannot swallow this world-wide kingdom, together with the deputy of that monarch who vainly tempted Christ with the same bait.

(5) Our sagacious friend offers as the fifth mark of his true Lady-Church,— "that the Catholic Church teaches the same things everywhere, and at all times."

Which is as much as to say, that she tells lies and sticks to them: and there is nothing like *brazening it out*.

But this veracious and immutable Lady, happens to be really a few scheming old gentlemen, who in pretended councils and in private cabals, have from time to time as policy dictated, prescribed some lessons for their faithful children, who all believe what the Church believes, because the old Lady will whip them if they do not. So the faithful are only echoes to a few conspiring priests, who call themselves the Church, and make all repeat after them, on pain of excommunication.

And then this metaphorical Lady of course says, that she always says the same thing; which is all the evidence she gives to Protestants, whilst

Catholics dare not say a word to their mother for fear of being sent to bed without their supper. Now if she has always taught the same everywhere, she has told lies long enough, and therefore it is time she taught something fresh, to hit upon the truth by chance.

(6) A sixth trial of our swallowing powers, is given in the fact, that "the Catholic Church is the true Church, because it is a kingdom of itself, quite separate from the kingdoms of this world." And so is Utopia. Our afflicted friend Mr. Wilberforce, declares that "the Pope's bishops do not ask for a seat in the House of Lords, nor any money, nor lands, nor tithes, nor church-rates, nor any powers given by law; these things they *leave* to the queen's Church, because these things belong to the kingdom of this world."

Good simple soul, how well he swallows, and presumes upon the like capacity in us.

Who had these seats and tithes by law, before the present Church of England? Who originated this whole system? Mr. Wilberforce's Pope's bishops: it all descends from them; yet they, innocent souls, repudiate all such things, because they always teach the same principles; namely, the principles of policy; to get what they can, and to pretend they do not want, what they know they cannot get.

Now, if because the Church of Rome, is in England separate from the State, it is therefore Christ's Church, *whose Church was it when it was united to the State in England?*

But it is quite natural for a man who has lost his senses, to think we have lost ours.

But if again, to be separated from the kingdoms of the world, is a mark of the true Church, what will our friend say of his friend the Pope, who has a crown and a mitre on the same head; who is both a temporal king and a meddling priest; and whose cardinals are ministers of State?

So that if the Catholic Church is a true Church in England, it is a lying Church in Rome, and in all places where it is protected by the State; therefore it is a lying Church in England also, for as Wilberforce says, it is *the same everywhere*.

(7) "Another proof that the Catholic Church is the true Church, is, that her bishops and priests have power from Christ to forgive sins, by his authority."

Then they have sufficient employment, in forgiving their own sins, most of all, the sins of lying, and for this the greatest lie of all, for Christ neither mentioned them, nor gave them any authority; it is God that forgives our sins for Christ's sake; and who gave the Apostles only, the power to tell us this in an authoritative manner.

(8) "Another sign that the Catholic Church is the true Church, and that Protestant sects are not; viz., the Catholic Church still keeps up the custom of anointing the sick with oil."—(James v. 14.)

This is a mistake, for the Latter-day Saints anoint with oil, as well as the Roman Catholics; and it seems to do as much good in the one case as in the other. So that this is a true mark of the Book-of-Mormon-Church.

It is peculiarly unfortunate for our Author's signs, that they make against him and his Lady, whenever they have any force: as in this

anointing with oil ; James mentions it as a way of raising men up from a sick bed ; the Catholics do it as a way of laying men down in a cold grave : with them it is the *extreme* unction, the last office to prepare for death, with the Apostle it was to restore to life : so that this oil, is the death of the Roman Church's pretensions,

(9) "There is another thing which shows how much more the Catholic Church is like Scripture. She continues every day, offering of sacrifice to God."

And this is Scriptural undoubtedly, as our Author proves by the case of the Patriarchs and the Jews ; and so is circumcision Scriptural, and the sacrificing of bulls and goats, all are Scriptural, by the Old Testament or Jewish Scriptures ; but they are all unscriptural by the New Testament. As our forgetful friend afterwards confesses, "there was no need of *these* sacrifices any more," after Christ was offered. Yet he refers to them to prove that sacrifice is Scriptural, and by the Jewish marks proves the Roman Church.

Besides these Israelitish sacrifices which belong to the Church of Moses and of the Pope, not to the Church of Christ, Mr. Wilberforce lays great stress on the declaration of Malachi, (i. 11.) "for, from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering."

But it also declared in the prophets, that Jerusalem should be built up and become the praise of the whole earth, that the Gentiles shall see her righteousness, and all kings her glory, "thou shalt also be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God, thou shalt no more be termed forsaken, neither shall thy land any more be termed desolate."—(Isa. lxii. 1—4.)

Is this prophecy fulfilled ? Yes. Is the earthly Jerusalem such a place as is there described ? No. Then the prophecies are spiritual not carnal, and there will no more be carnal sacrifice and incense, than an earthly Jerusalem.

Nothing is more common in the prophecies, than such promises to Jerusalem, but the Roman Catholic priests dare not say this means the old city ; for then the promises are not fulfilled ; and besides, Rome would be eclipsed in the splendour of the ancient city of God. But to secure all this to themselves, they will make old Rome the new Jerusalem, and have spiritual promises to save their geography, whilst they adopt carnal prophecies to save their mummeries.

The sixtieth chapter of Isaiah, celebrates the eternal excellency and supremacy of Zion ; but if that means a spiritual Zion, the true Israel of God under Christ, then the prophecies are not to be interpreted of carnal things ; if it means the former Zion, then the glory of Rome is departed : so that either way, Mr. Wilberforce's Church is ruined. And if by the name of Zion or Jerusalem, the prophets meant not a human city, so by sacrifice and incense they meant not outward things.

Now Paul says we are to come unto Mount Zion, the New Jerusalem ; by which he meant not a city of buildings, but a spiritual assembly ; and he says also we are the true circumcision, by which he repudiated the circumcision in the flesh ; and so by our living sacrifice, he meant a spiri-

tual service, not outward mummeries.—(Heb. xii. 22—24. Phil. iii. 3. Rom. xii. 1.)

We do not doubt but the Roman Catholic Church will be the true and only Church, and Malachi's promise of incense in every place, be carnally fulfilled, when this prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled in the same way,—

"The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf, and the young lion, and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them."—(Isa. xi. 7.) When we see such groups of happy families, Protestants will set up incense pots; but until this happens, Rome may sell her censers to redeem her credit. The true sacrifice and incense which Paul commends, is not wafers nor smoke, but thanksgiving and praise; the dedication of ourselves, body, soul, and spirit unto God.

"By him (*i. e.* the Redeemer) therefore let us offer unto God *the sacrifice of praise* continually; that is, *the fruit of our lips* giving thanks to his name."—(Heb. xiii. 15.)

But Mr. Wilberforce is for the carnal (miscalled the literal) fulfilment of the one prophecy that suits his Church; let him then have fruit (cherries, apples or oranges) growing from his lips, whenever the censer is in his hands; or rather, to return to the prophets, let him say we, Hosea (xiv. 2.) "so will we render the CALVES of *our lips*;" and then may he be addressed in the words of his own Malachi,—"*ye shall go forth, and grow up as the calves of the stall.*"—(Malachi iv. 2.)

We leave him in this Scriptural, literal, and promised condition, whilst we proceed to his tenth mark of a true Church,—the ALTAR or "crib," where we are invited to eat such incongruous and indigestible provender.

(10) "The system of the Roman Catholic Church, is the only system which agrees with ALL PARTS of *holy Scripture*; for instance, what can a Protestant understand about the words,—'*we have AN ALTAR,*' (Heb. xiii. 10.) and '*the sacrificing of the Gentiles?*'"—(Rom. xv. 16.)

Our patient-physician has rambled a good deal before about this altar, and seems unable to get it out of his head.

To prove its importance he refers to the Jewish system, declaring that "when Protestants see the (Roman) priest dressed in rich vestments of red or gold, turning away from the people towards the altar, and bowing down before it, often busy for some time without even speaking one word out loud, they (the Protestants) go away puzzled;" and well they may: but they are reminded of Zacharias who "was a Jewish priest, and was alone with God while the people stood without praying, at the time of incense. Nothing like this was ever seen in a Protestant Church, but in any Catholic Church you may see it any Sunday, &c."

By which he unwittingly proves that his Church is Levitical, and not Christian; *so it adopts all Scripture, namely the law of Moses*, though we are told that Moses and Elias were taken away, that we might hear Christ only.—(Mark ix. 1—8.)

Nor are our Catholic friends even proper Jews, for the Jews stood without, the Catholics stand within, and see all the priest's gesticulations: *the Jews could not see Zacharias till he came out to them.*

And "if any one feels the ceremonies and rich vestments a difficulty, let him only read the minute and particular laws given by God himself,

for the sacrifices of the *Jewish priests*,—their robes of 'blue and scarlet, &c.,'—and he will see that the 'mummeries' of the Catholic worship, are nothing more than God commanded in the offering of sacrifice to him."

Thus do the confusion and insanity of our Author become manifest, as he claims the dress of the *Jewish priests* for the Christian sanctuary; forgetting that the same God also commanded in the same law the sacrifice of "two lambs day by day continually."—(Exodus xxix. 38.)

He forgets also that these priests married and had legitimate children; who became the lineal successors of their fathers in office and support. And therefore his objections to the marriage of priests, are as he says, "objections against the holy Scriptures."

Thus do they take in all Scripture, namely all Scripture that suits them, though it be abolished Jewish law; and omit all Scripture that does not suit them, whether Jewish or Christian; and by these means do they manufacture THAT ALTAR; on which "*they crucify the Son of God afresh, and put him to open shame.*"—(Heb. vi. 6.)

For they declare by the mouth of Mr. Wilberforce and teach the same thing everywhere, that Christ is offered up again, (*i. e.* sacrificed or crucified) daily on their altars.

"For the sacrifices (in the law) which they offered year by year continually, could never make the comers thereunto perfect; for then (if they had made them perfect) WOULD THEY NOT HAVE CEASED TO BE OFFERED?"—(Heb. x. 1, 2.)

So that the only reason for a repetition of the sacrifice, was its weakness,—its not making men perfect; whereas "by ONE offering Christ hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," (Heb. x. 14.) therefore according to the Apostle's argument, it HATH CEASED to be offered. "We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus ONCE;" (Heb. x. 10.) now the priests on their boasted altar, offer over and over again, and so deny that he has made them perfect; and imitate the Jewish priests in this also, of entering frequently to make atonement, forgetting that "the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sin," for "where remission of sins is, there NO MORE offering for sin" (Heb. x. 18.) "but in those (Roman and Jewish) sacrifices there is a remembrance (or confession of unforgiven) sins made again every year," (Heb. x. 3.) thus putting Christ to shame, as if his ONE offering were not enough. The frequent offerings up of Christ on the Roman altar, are declared by Mr. Wilberforce to be the mark of the true Church; whereas it is the mark of *Judaism*, of an *abolished* religion, as Paul says, "for Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself OFTEN, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was ONCE offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation."—(Heb. ix. 24—28.)

Whilst the testimony of Paul is so plain respecting Christ, our Author

absolutely declares, that the sacrifice of the Saviour, put an end to all *other* sacrifices, but was itself to be repeated daily all over the world: so Christ is with them offered more than once. "This sacrifice," says Mr. Wilberforce, "is offered every day by the priests of the Catholic Church, and Protestants do not even pretend to it:" of course not; for Paul directly denies it, and therefore your Roman altar is not the altar of Paul.—(Heb. vii. 27.)

When that Apostle said "*we* have an altar," he was not speaking for the Roman priesthood, but to Christian Hebrews; and was probably referring to the actual Jewish temple not yet destroyed; or if in reference to the Saviour, it could mean nothing respecting his being offered up often; nor to any material altar, any more than being crucified with Christ, means dying bodily on a wooden cross.

"The sacrificing of the Gentiles" as Mr. Wilberforce terms it, (Rom. xv. 16.) is undoubtedly often fulfilled by the Roman Church, as wherever she possesses the power, she sacrifices Protestants on the altar of her persecutions. He must be truly of the Swallowell line, who can take in these altars, and priests, everything in the Jewish system that will serve to garnish this sepulchre of Christianity, in which Christ is offered up again, crucified afresh.

(11) This spiritual physician advances still further in his claims for our enlarged receiving powers, by an eleventh attack in these words, "Protestants cannot understand those texts which speak of what are called '*counsels of perfection.*'"

No, this is a stretch beyond most of us; being an improvement on "the whole counsel of God."

These "counsels of perfection," consists of duties not essential to all Christians, but entered into by some for superior blessedness, as vows of poverty, celibacy, obedience, &c.

These counsels however, Mr. Wilberforce tells us, were all carried out in the life of the Saviour; who condescended to be born of Mary, "who had consecrated her virginity by a vow unto God." It is not stated who gave Mr. Wilberforce this information; *but it is certain that our Lord's first miracle was at a wedding, and not at the taking of a veil.*

It is equally certain that OUR LORD POSITIVELY CONDEMNED ALL RELIGIOUS VOWS; even though they were in some cases allowed in the law of Moses.

"It hath been said by them of old time, (namely, in the Mosaic law,) thou shalt not forswear thyself, but *perform unto the Lord thine oaths;*" here he plainly speaks of something religious vowed "unto the Lord;" and he alters the law, saying—"I say unto you, **SWEAR NOT AT ALL,**" that is, *make no religious vows at all.*—(Matt. v. 33, 34.)

The ancient law on this subject, is in Numbers xxx, where we read (v. 2).—"If a man vow a vow unto the Lord, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond, he shall not break his word, &c."

This is the religious vow, common to the Roman Catholic orders of the religious, monks, nuns, &c., in all their variety: and this is what our Lord refers to, when he says, "I say unto you, **SWEAR NOT AT ALL,**" all religious vows therefore are in opposition to the law of Christ; whether vows of celibacy, poverty, obedience, or what not: so that these

"counsels of perfection," are an insult to the divine counsels, and are marks of a false Church.

The vows of poverty are encouraged, in order to get the riches of persons and families into the Church's power; not that they care for the poor, but because they are the thief that carries the bag, as Christ said of Judas. Hence they will rob some poor old man, as they did lately, or try to entrap some rich young woman, as lately exhibited, with the romance of a life of poverty, that the convent may be rich; and out of a great sum, dispense a few basins of thin soup to a degraded and pauperized class of priest-ridden victims.

These are their counsels of perfection; by which they got a few thousands lately from a dying old man, and in a law suit split the difference with his robbed and poverty-stricken relatives. Their vows of poverty, mean vows to impoverish devotees and enrich convents.

The counsel of perfection called *obedience*, means obedience to man, not to Christ, all the drones in a convent or irreligious house, *vowing against Christ's law*, to obey the superior in all things, instead of obeying Christ. They will not be his servants, so they must be some one's slaves; and put out both their eyes, and seal up their reason, and extinguish their conscience, in order to be led blindfold by an ecclesiastical superior.

And this, poor Wilberforce defends, by that passage out of Peter—(1 Pet. v. 5.)—"ALL of you be *subject one to another*, and be clothed with humility."

This is not a rule for a convent, but for ALL Christians, and therefore is by our Author excluded from a counsel of perfection, which is *extra-work*.

And further, it does not say be subject to one only; but every one of you rule, and every one of you obey; give and take, be courteous and benevolent; whereas in the obedience of a convent, there is nothing of this mutual service, all serve one, as slaves to a slave-owner. As he says—"in each house there is some ONE ruler, whom all the rest obey in everything." These counsels will not go down except with the Swallowells.

(13) Our Author's twelfth mark of his Lady-church, is so vast and portentous, that we dare not commence upon it, till our readers' throats are enlarged by the thirteenth, which is the last with Mr. Wilberforce, but we must postpone his *miracles* to that honourable position. *His Church is, and has been, hated by the world, and evil spoken of.* This he takes as a mark of the Church, mentioned by Christ. But in this again, our poor friend is quite mistaken; the blessed disciples of Christ, are not only to be ill spoken of, but men are to say all manner of evil against them "*falsely*;" it is to be unfounded calumny, and is to be for *his sake*. He was hated for telling the truth; Wilberforce's Church is hated for telling lies: it is too much to expect us to take in these two things as the same. The Church of Rome is hated for her own sake, the Church of Christ is hated for his name's sake.

Our Author likes to take his instances to suit his case; and so fixes on England, where the Roman Hierarchy has not legislative support; and makes England, (the majority) the world, hating the Church; but what will he say of Italy, of Spain, &c.? Is his Church hated by the world *there*? No: *then it loses its marks in different countries.*

He tells us, a man may become a Dissenter without any evil surmises; but if he becomes a Catholic, he is "abandoned by dear friends and relations." *Is this true at Rome?* No. And it was not true in England, when Milton's father was disinherited for becoming a Protestant; nor when the bishops of Rome were in the English House of Lords.

As to ill names, used against Rome; *does she ever speak of Protestants without an implied curse; are we not in her mouth heretics, schismatics, devoted to damnation?*

Thus is her mouth full of cursing and bitterness, the poison of asps is under her tongue.

Not only does she consign to hell, every Protestant, and deny the possibility of our salvation; BUT SHE PURSUES EVERY CONVERT FROM HER MUMMERIES, WITH CHARGES OF THE MOST ATROCIOUS VILLANY, FROM LUTHER DOWN TO ACHILL. What great Reformer has she not vainly tried to cover with the black cloud of her slander?

Then she wipes her mouth and whines through Wilberforce that she is the true Church, because she is ill spoken of; *we* employ such hard words, that this finicking fine Lady, who had just been scolding like a Billingsgate fish-wife, pulls out her scent-bottle, spreads her white handkerchief, and faints most fashionably. She has quite won poor Wilberforce, and he will never marry anybody else: he swears that the charge of persecution brought against Rome, is "simply and absolutely false;" and that "there is no Catholic State, in which Protestants are not better off than Catholics still are in England;" and he is obliged to say this, to please his new mistress, though he knows well that a man dare not sell nor possess a Protestant Bible in Rome, whilst a priest dare burn a Protestant Bible in England.

Thus in his new infatuation, does he willingly say things that are "simply and absolutely false," in his abject adoration to kiss the ground his mistress walks on, and declares that it is as clean as a well scraped trencher. Thus do the enemies of truth ever lick the dust whilst, they are frequently so judiciously blinded as to "glory in their shame."

By this thirteenth mark, we perceive how much this questionable Lady, needs patching up; and yet, instead of painting herself, here is another gentleman page, to serve even at her toilette: that he may help to dress up and adorn his goddess before worshipping her; as he makes the water before bowing down and eating it.

Both their Church and their Christ, are creations of their own.

(12) We have reserved the twelfth mark of Rome's Ladyship to the last place, because it is so very remarkable; and here Mr. Wilberforce shall speak at length.

"There is another sign of the true Church which Catholics have among them. They know that in the Catholic Church God still works miracles, as our Lord clearly promised that they should go on to the end in the Church (see St. Mark xvi. 17.) They were promised to last; and in the Catholic Church they do last still, while no such thing is heard of among Protestants.

"If a man dare not deny the power of God to work miracles, then I do not see how he can help believing those which he works now, as well as those which he worked long ago. For instance, in a book called A

Journal in France, by the Rev. T. W. Allies, I find an account of two wonderful cures worked at Paris, in May, 1848. Mr. Allies gives the full account by the doctor who attended the cases, and who saw them before the cure, and after it; and the persons themselves who were cured are now alive and well in the city of Paris, where Mr. Allies saw them. One of them was a nun of the Sisters of Charity, who was dying of an injury to the spine, which she got in lifting a sick person. The other was a girl of fourteen, who lost her eyesight for nine months, and recovered it in a moment when receiving the blessed Sacrament, on the 12th of May, 1848. Mr. Allies has been abused for publishing these stories; but no person has ever tried to shew that they are not true, or to account for them without a miracle. To mention another fact; in the year 1842, a young Jew, named Ratisbon, who hated the very name of Jesus Christ our Lord, went to Rome. He was rich; he was engaged to be married to a young cousin whom he much loved, and he was to be partner in trade with his uncle, one of the richest men in Europe. Suddenly he became a Christian, though he had all his life hated Christians and Christianity, and though he knew that if he became a Christian, he must give up all his hopes and prospects on earth,—his wife and his riches. His uncle, he well knew, would never allow a Christian to marry his daughter, or to be partner in his business. His friends and family would neither see him nor speak to him again. But all this he gave up to be a Christian and a Catholic; and then, not content with this, HE GAVE UP HIS OWN PROPERTY TO BUILD A NEW CHURCH; and he himself became a member of one of those brotherhoods which I have already described to you, and is now living a single life, in obedience and poverty, when he might, if he had wished it, have lived still in luxury, wealth, and splendour. These facts are as certain, and can as little be denied as the sun at noonday. How is the change to be accounted for? It was most sudden and unexpected. A Christian friend who was *showing him the sights of Rome, being called away*, LEFT HIM BY HIMSELF waiting his return in an empty church;—he left him a bigoted Jew, hating the very name of Christian; he returned in a few minutes, and found the proud Jew lying upon the ground, and asking to be taken to a priest for baptism. What happened to change his mind, he himself will tell us. He says, that while he was waiting in the church, he saw *standing in the air*, the blessed Virgin Mary. She appeared in glory, with a light like fire proceeding from her. He could not help knowing who she was, *for he had seen a medal on which was an EXACT figure of her*, as she appeared in glory to a nun at Paris some time ago; and the person he saw was the same that he had seen upon the medal. Now you must remember, that the unbelief of the Jews is in this, they deny that God has been born in our flesh. They say God could not possibly be born of a woman or die upon the Cross. So they say, poor creatures, in their blindness of unbelief. But when this Jew saw the blessed Virgin Mary, the mother of God the Son, in her glory, he could deny it no more. The strong places of his unbelief were broken down. The grace of God came into his heart, he believed, and confessed the truth, and gave up all to follow it. He has hitherto persevered in his faith, and may it please God to give him the gift of perseverance to the end, that he may see and adore

him for ever, face to face, who called him by this wonderful vision, when he was an enemy and an unbeliever. No man, I think, can fail to see how like this story is to that of the conversion of St. Paul.—(Acts ix.) But, *you will observe*, it pleased God by this vision, *not merely* to convert an unbeliever, but *also to sanction that species of veneration* which Catholics pay to the blessed mother of our Lord and God, Jesus Christ."

Upon this miracle, we have a few observations to make; and in the words of Mr. Wilberforce, we say to the reader "*you will observe*:"—

1. That this young man was rich.
2. That the Church got his money.
3. That this property served to build a new church.
4. That no such miracles can be afforded to convert one who is already poor.
5. It is a method of making men poor and the Church rich.
6. Peter said, thy money perish with thee.
7. His successors say—thy money perish with us.
8. What did the *Christian friend* shew him *the sights* in Rome for?
9. Who *called the Christian friend away*, to leave the poor fellow alone in the Church?
10. How came the doll on fire, who supplied the *fireworks*, the wires, &c.?
11. The artist who made the medal, imitated it in this picture; *it was not like the virgin, but like a medal*, concocted from the dreams of a nun.
12. Paul did not see the Virgin Mary in the air, but heard a voice from the Saviour.
13. This miracle was a *Roman* one, and served two ends, to get the money, and "sanction that species of veneration," which it *never* "pleased God to sanction" in the Apostles' times; but pleases the Pope's abettors to sanction now, by a trick learned in a penny theatre.
14. Does not this explain why the picture of the Madonna, at Rimini, *winked* at the priests?*
15. Is it not time that the people opened their eyes and buttoned their *pockets*—the point of miraculous invasion?
16. Is not the Rev. George Swallowell to be pitied, who was convinced by such arguments; and should we not use all means for the restoration of his descendants, that they may return to their right mind, and sit at the feet of him whose religion and miracles are burlesqued and dishonoured by the sanctified fraud and avarice of men who in his outraged name, exhibit cunning for wisdom and priestcraft for religion?

* See, Rimini and Oxford: or the Miraculous Picture of Mary, and a Divine Portrait of the Church. Ward & Co. London.

III.

STATESMEN'S RELIGION.

"EVERY PLANT WHICH MY HEAVENLY FATHER HATH NOT PLANTED,
SHALL BE ROOTED UP."—(Matt. xv. 13.)

In those who think a National Church right, Dissent is a sin; in those who think it wrong, silence is a shame.

THE THEORY OF INTOLERANCE,

AS INVOLVED IN THE NAMES AND WORDS APPLIED TO RELIGIOUS
PARTIES AND DOCTRINES.

(Continued from page 319.)

IF as the advocates of supremacy maintain, it would be a paradox and contradiction to uphold the sturdy plea of dissenting consciences together with the rights of governors, it will follow simply that one of these must give way;—either kings or consciences. This is not a choice between two evils, but between an evil and a good, between tyranny and freedom, between usurpers and conscience; let slaves choose the former.

Yet we are told, that Christianity never could have succeeded in the world, in the teeth of magistrates; whereas this is the way in which it did succeed,—in defiance of all established powers, temporal and spiritual.

But according to the principles of Dr. South and his followers, kings were the salvation of the infant Church: so then it would seem that "the kings of the earth" did *not* "stand up together against the Lord and against his anointed;" nor was there any opposition between the two; for otherwise, how could "the Christian religion have made such a wonderful spread in the world?" And how could Bishop Jewel, in his Apology for the Church of England assert that "*our* religion on the contrary" in opposition to the Romish—"having been opposed from the very beginning by emperors and so many kings,—is at last brought even into the palaces of kings:—these things might sufficiently prove *that God himself fights for us*?" Now this idea of divine help, does not seem to have entered into South's argument; or perhaps he might have answered this also, by a reference to "impossibility," when kings are not God's allies. But does Bishop Jewel, abjure royal aid? no: for in a letter respecting the Council of Trent, he says, "nor was there any one cause, why God settled Governments in the world greater than this; viz., that there might be some to preserve religion and piety in safety." So then it seems, that these appointed safeguards were a long time hostile to the Bishop's religion; from which he might have learned either to question

whether they were its appointed safeguards; or whether his was the right religion.

But to return to Dr. South's enquiry: his argument proves that the Apostles never acted anti-magistratically; either when Peter refused to obey; or when Paul told them to come themselves and fetch them out. And our preacher, almost in the same breath enquires, "for may not he (the magistrate) naturally argue,—can that religion be true or divine, that does not enforce obedience to magistrates?"

Now this may be a very *natural* way of arguing, but it is not a *legitimate* method: it is very natural for people to argue in their own favour. The Queen of Madagascar, could make a tolerable syllogism, on this principle: and all the "kings and governors" who were to scourge the disciples, were well armed with the natural logic,—“can that religion be true, which questions our authority?"

But the Doctor, is not always inditing a philippic against the Round-heads; therefore sometimes mentions truths which at other times he forgets.

In his first sermon on "The Fatal Imposture and Force of Words," he combats the doctrine "that good and evil, honest and dishonest, are originally founded on the laws and constitutions of the sovereign Civil Power: the opinion heretofore of Epicurus, and lately of one amongst ourselves, a less philosopher, though the greater heathen of the two,—the infamous author of the *Leviathan*." And again, "a blind guide is certainly a great mischief, but a guide who blinds those whom he should lead, is undoubtedly a much greater." Now a "supreme" king, in religious matters, is both these evils; being a blind guide, and the cause of blindness in others; since he prevents them from seeing—or persecutes them for it: which indeed is the bounden duty of every king who has a rightful religious supremacy: he has no more authority, to dispense with the religious laws, than with the other laws of the realm. Bishop Jewel speaking of the Pope, who had summoned the Council of Trent, says, "nor will he (the Pope) enter a league with us, (the Church of England) on any other terms than those proposed by Nabash, King of Ammon, to the men of Jabesh-gilead, 'that he may thrust out all our eyes:' (1 Sam. xi. 2.) for he will deprive us of the holy Scriptures."*

The withholding of the Bible is *not* putting out men's eyes; it is keeping away from them that which they should look at; but to give men this Bible, and yet deny their right to examine and come to their own conclusion; *this* is putting out men's eyes, and mocking them with a gift that can be of no value;—a guide they may not follow:—except so far as this guide seems to point Church-ward.

But South himself, generally provides an answer to all his attacks on private conscience, and the exhibition of this in the shape of Dissent:—"Reason" says he, "is undeservedly and ignorantly traduced, when it is set up and shot at, as the irreconcilable enemy of religion"† And that by reason he means private conscience, or individual reason, is plain from the nature of the subject, (unless indeed only kings have reason,) as well as from the following noble sentiment, "I cannot think or persuade myself that God gave us eyes, only that we may pluck them out; and

* Apology of the Church of England.

† Sermon on the Trinity.

brought us into this world with reason, that being born men, we might afterwards grow up and improve into brutes, and become elaborately irrational." What then becomes of the statement, that "it is ten to one, that God rather speaks in the conscience of a lawful Christian magistrate, making a law, than in the consciences of any private persons whatever, dissenting from it?"* What constitutes a lawful *Christian magistrate*? A lawful Civil magistrate, is plain enough: but the other needs to be defined. It would be a useful logical treatise, that should explain the rationale of "royal reason;" and shew how a royal conscience, is worth ten times more, than any number of private consciences. Though if we owe obedience to the king's conscience, in every respect,—we might have done without a conscience ourselves; and the command "fear God, and honour the king;" might be compressed into—"honour the king;" for he would be God to us, and our duty would lead us no farther than his throne. Indeed the better plan would have been, to have constructed the world on Gladstone's principle; providing each monarch with a "national conscience;" and leaving the common people without this disturber of private and public peace. And methinks, if God had intended Kings or Governments to be our sole guides, we should have been born blind: but the fact of having eyes, is an indication that we should use them, to find out our own way, by the best helps we can discover. *For private judgment does not mean the absence of help; but the absence of authority.*

But has not the National Church a claim on all good subjects, since it is sanctioned by the powers that be,—who are ordained of God? These powers are not ordained of God, out of their own province: nor are all powers of God, in the sense of sanction, but in the sense of permission: the idolatrous kings of Israel, were ordained of God; but were not ordained to enforce idolatry: though they might have used the argument from the divine right of kings: and very consistently,—since they should have a divine right, to take that place which belongs only to the Divine Being.

There are powers of darkness; spiritual wickedness in high places; high in political and ecclesiastical position: these are not to be obeyed: nor does the word power properly represent legitimate authority: those that are of God, are not simply powers, but authorized powers, and this is the meaning of the words—the powers that be are ordained of God. Lawful authorities have his sanction.

But we are often reminded, that Nero was a wicked emperor, yet men were to be ruled by him. What! *in his wickedness*? then where was the virtue of Shadrach, Meshech, and Abednego? They were rebels; and Dissenters. "Yes, but *that* king did not command the right religion." And pray is not the conscience of a king worth more than a private conscience? Are individual subjects to guide a king's religion? They had better be kings at once. For the Dissenters will say, our king does not establish the right religion—since he vitiates religion by interposing kingly authority, between us and "*one*" who is our Master.

"But can Dissenters *prove* that the National Church is wrong?" Perhaps not to a national Churchman; nor is it necessary; since Dis-

* Sermon on "the Plea of a Tender Conscience."

senters are not to act in accordance with the convictions of others; and therefore it is enough, if the point be proved to themselves.* Proof, is an ambiguous word; and a thing is proved or not proved, according to the effect produced by the evidence upon different individuals. This fallacy would be best explained and removed by stating an equivalent proposition: the Conformist says, *you cannot prove, i. e. you cannot make me believe*, that the Church is wrong; therefore you are not justified in separation. To which the answer becomes plain—are my works then, to be founded on your faith?

It would have been difficult for the three Hebrew martyrs to have proved—to the king, that his religion was wrong: but they had nothing to do with this; they were to act upon what was *proved to themselves*. Which brings us back to the supremacy of private conscience, and worshipping God as *we think*; not as Government thinks; which has received no delegation to think for us on such questions.

Nero therefore had no authority to command any wickedness, nor any irreligion: for if he had, Christians were bound to obey him; and then, instead of being sent “to the lions,” they would have gone to a heathen temple, and worshipped without more ado, like good subjects.

But the gospel came to overthrow all existing religious systems, by whomsoever upheld; it took no direct share in politics, and therefore denied the authority of both kings and priests in religion, whilst it acknowledged the authority of kings in civil matters. Indeed, if the early Christians had acknowledged the supremacy of governors in religion, the gospel would have been silenced: since kings invariably endeavoured to overthrow it. So that every convert was a Dissenter, and every Apostle threw defiance at the combined authority of kings and priests.

Which plainly proves that they were to submit to Nero, and all other emperors, only so far as these did not interfere with the authority and commands of Christ; in other words, the gospel acknowledges kings, as political sovereigns, and commands the disciples to be obedient, “for the Lord’s sake;” but on religious questions, when the Lord’s name is contemned, and his authority countermanded, they were to be firm to their Saviour, and bid defiance mildly, but courageously, to every enemy however exalted.

If the primitive Christians were not wrong in obeying Christ, they were right in disobeying Nero: therefore, the *command to be “subject” did not extend to religion*, otherwise it would have overthrown religion, and placed Nero above Christ. And if the command could not at *that time* mean submit to kings on religious questions, it does not mean this now, and therefore however much paraded, is not at all to the point.†

When, therefore, under the term supremacy, patronized ecclesiastics

* This fallacy is very frequent and triumphant:—“can you prove the Church wrong? No: then you ought to stay in it:” that is, a Dissenter should become a conformist, because he cannot prove dissent—to a *Churchman’s satisfaction*.

† A complete and systematic exposure of the false applications of *passages* would require a separate discussion: we are here referring to them, only so far as they bear upon certain words and names: supremacy, &c.

cover the doctrine of *spiritual* supremacy, they insert *an idea* which does not actually belong to the Scripture which they quote: indeed, they take advantage of double meanings, and apply the same term to various and inconsistent subjects.

And when monarchs under this ecclesiastical (not Scriptural) shield, lay claim to spiritual supremacy, they are not ministers of God, but usurpers of God's prerogative.

The term Dissenter then, is a nick-name, founded upon two false standards,—a National Church, and a king's supremacy.

Before entering briefly into the examination of the other names arising out of false standards, we may consider the principles of words and names laid down by Dr. South, on "the fatal imposture and force of words and names, falsely applied." No man could better describe this imposture, and no one has better *exemplified* it. He shews first, that the way in which good and evil operate on the mind, is by the respective names under which they are notified and conveyed: and secondly, the evil resulting from a misuse of names; proceeding in the last place to give noted instances thereof, with which indeed his sermons abound.

For instance, the following title as the topic for a sermon,—"*Pretence of Conscience no excuse for Rebellion.*"

Now, a pretence of this sort, may be an excuse, though not a valid reason. Yet it is an excuse which no one ever pleaded; and therefore, the removal of it will convict no one: it was never yet heard as an argument—"I *pretend* to a conscience." And therefore, this is a sermon preached to nobody. But the misuse of words consists in assuming that the plea of conscience is a pretence. And the term "rebellion," is equally ambiguous, since there must first be a legitimate authority; otherwise, instead of rebellion on the one side, we have usurpation on the other. Now in a case of conscience, there can be no rebellion against a prince, except the Prince of Conscience—Jesus Christ; and whoever steps into his place, and seeks to rule consciences, does by that act commit the double sin of rebellion against the sovereign, and usurpation over the equal subjects. This is a specimen of the noted illustrations, which our Author himself affords, of the misuse of words: we may also notice some instances, which he adduces as the mistaken language of others; as in "the *villainous* and *malicious* calling of the religion of the Church of England, Popery:" and secondly, which is like thereunto, "calling such as have *schismatically* deserted its communion, true Protestants." Here we may notice, that in rebutting slanders, the Doctor takes occasion to be slanderous.

Villany and malice are not essential ingredients in the composition of those who see Popery in the Church of England; for many of its best friends mourn over its too evident leanings that way; nor can any persons *schismatically* leave a communion, for, as we shall presently see, a *schismatic* is not a separatist. The first false name, Popery, given to the Church, is refuted by the Doctor, rather more curiously than logically; by shewing that *in many respects this Church is not Popish*; because in some things it directly controverts certain Roman Catholic doctrines. "Which of these," he enquires, "do our learned *mouthng* friends of the *fanatic* party, prove to be held by our Popish Church of England as

they call it?" "Thus," says he, "I thought fit to prove, by a *kind of* inductive demonstration, that what contradicts, overthrows, and destroys *every article* of Popery, is not and cannot be Popish." This is bold, round, and full to the point: yet, to prove that *some* part of Church of England doctrine is not Popish, does not prove that *no* part of that doctrine is so. It is certainly a *kind of* inductive argument, to prove the whole (in such a case) from enumerating a few parts, but it is a *false kind of* induction. For a vessel may leak in one part, though very sound in another: nor is it very valid logic, to prove that she will never sink, because there is one decent plank left. Nay, though every plank were sound, and no leakages possible, she might sail in a wrong direction, and become manned by impressment, and guided by despotism.

Thus also, even if every article of doctrine, should be opposed to Popery, it might still be Popish in the essential principle of Church domination, as implied in this very defence by Dr. South, who is quite enough of the Inquisitor, in such properly applied names, as the "cursed and soul-ruining schism" of dissent.

For as our Author says in another place, and for another purpose, (he has a flag for every sea) "if," says he, "implicit faith, be as some say, the property of a Roman Catholic, then am I sure Popery may be found where the name of Papist is abhorred."

And if the property of the Romish Church, be to demand this implicit faith, then we are sure, that those who consider dissent a sin are not far from Peter's chair. Which leads to the second supposed slander of the Church, viz., that those who leave it are true Protestants. A statement unexceptionable, unless the Reformation was simply a contest between Henry VIII. and Clement VII. Protestantism was not a struggle for the rights of kings, but for the rights of conscience, and the supremacy of Christ; and consequently, they, who follow the dictates of conscience, rather than the usurpation of King or Parliament, these are not only true Protestants, but the only Protestants.

"The fourth abused name or word," says he, "by which the *faction*, (a name, but no abuse,) in practising upon the Church and the government of it, is their *miscalling* (!) the laws made on behalf of the Church—*persecution*." "And now, if this pitiful sham and term of art, persecution, shall be able to screen those *spiritual riots*, and *sedition meetings*, that look so terribly upon the Government, from the *justice* of it, how can it possibly be safe?" "Spiritual riots," are new things, but since they will never even go the length of breaking a window; since they are "spiritual" and not political riots, they form sedition against a spiritual and not a political tribunal; and therefore, political Government may turn the edge of its "justice" another way. But South can best answer himself, in the style of "diamond cut diamond:" for whilst "persecution" is a wretched sham, and term of art, in a Dissenter's mouth, it "doth become the mouth" of a Churchman very "well," when the tables are turned. So that his own abuse of this term, may be very well exposed, in his exposure of some one else's abuse: "and lastly," says he, "there are some, so extremely ill-natured, as to think it very *lunful and allowable for them to be sensible when they are injured and oppressed*: when they are slandered in their good names, wronged in their just interests,

and withal dare to own what they find and feel, without being such beasts of burden, as tamely to bear whatever is cast upon them, or such spaniels as lick the foot that kicks them, or to thank the goodly great one for doing them all these back favours." It is not every writer that presents us with the bane and antidote.

One other specimen from South, and we have done with him for the present.

"But setting aside noise and partiality, I would gladly know why *such* as suffer at Tyburn, should not be as high and loud in their clamours against persecution, as *these* men? if you say those men suffer for felony, these for conscience, I answer, there is as *much room* for a man to plead conscience for the breach of one law, as for the breach of another: *where* the matter of the law, is either good or indifferent, and both the one and the other stand enforced by *sufficient authority*." The first part of this, is noise and partiality: it is not for Tyburn men to clamour about persecution, so much as about prosecution: though, if kings be supreme in religion, we readily admit, that dissent is felony: and yet, it is a strange confusion in a true Protestant, to see no difference between Tyburn and Smithfield.

The latter part is such as every heretic in the three kingdoms could subscribe to, every law is to be obeyed, where the matter of the law is good or indifferent, and enforced by sufficient authority: it is exactly *the authority* that we question. But let our Author answer himself again: there is "another set of obstinate ill-natured persons, who are not to be brought by any one's guilt or greatness, to speak or write, to swear or lie, as they are bidden; or to *give up their own consciences, out of compliment to those who have none themselves*."

And thus we have examined, the foundation and meaning, of one condemnatory name, (dissent, Dissenter;) amounting to the same as Non-conformist, or similar epithets; which implies the standard of a National Church, and a sin against this usurped authority: which is disgraceful to such as presume to be the standard of truth to others, and an insult to that common Protestantism, that aimed to free men from Church authority, and bind every Church in exclusive obedience to the Shepherd and bishop of our souls. We have also brought the most vigorous Church champion, to overthrow Church assumption.

And now in conclusion, we have to deal with those sins, which are committed against National and Catholic Churches; sins which may be compressed into heresy and schism;—to know what these mean, you must consider who uses them.

These two pieces of iniquity, are usually classed together, but we shall make a few brief observations upon them separately.

And first, for SCHISM. This means literally, a rent or tear; and consequently expresses something in a body, and not something separate from it.

Dissent therefore, is not schism: * *being a new coat, and not a rent in an old one*, (very different things.) "No man putteth a piece of new cloth, on an old garment, for that which is put in, to fill up, taketh from the garment, and the *schism* is made worse." Now what schism? some-

* See "Dissent not Schism," a Discourse by T. BINNEY.

thing separate from the garment in question? no: but the schism in the garment itself: as though you should mend a spider's net, by the aid of a cable, which would only widen the breach: schisms then are *in any garment*; and *are often aggravated by the clumsy method of patching*: such for instance, as stitching on to the rent, an act of uniformity. The rent then becomes worse. The schism, does not mean entire separation, from a Church, but a certain method of conduct inside that Church, by its own members, is evident, for says the Apostle (1 Cor. xi. 18.) "first, being assembled in the Church, I hear there are *schisms* among you." They are not therefore separations, but unseemly contests and rivalries in the same communion;—heart-burnings under the same roof: which cannot apply to those who remove and dwell peaceably at a distance. Indeed, the essence of schism, is the want of charity and forbearance; they therefore are the true schismatics, who bring against others a "railing accusation:" and denounce them under the ill-names of schismatics and Dissenters.

Those therefore who take the Scriptural term schism, in an unscriptural sense, and dress up the Apostles in the masquerade of the fathers; first falsify the word of God, and secondly, violate the "communion of saints."

And besides, if the sin of schism, be separation from some communion, (which it is not,) they have further to prove, that *theirs* is this authoritative and true communion: and must give us more than their bare word for it.

Indeed, it is very plain, that the authority of any society extends only to its members: a father's authority, reaches only to his children; a monarch's to his subjects; and in the relation in which they are subjects: "what" any "law says, it says (only) to those who are under the law;"* but those who are out of the pale of a particular society, are not under its law, and therefore cannot sin against this law by schism, or by anything else. The idea then, of sinning against a Church, to which you do not belong, by not obeying laws which you are not under, is contradictory, absurd and impossible. Such a charge therefore as schism, brought against those who separate, is only the exhibition of the overgrown arrogance of that Church itself, interfering with another man's line of things, and notoriously stretching itself beyond its measure; it is this stretching which produces the rent; which tears the seamless coat of Christ, and gives rise to schism, in the body of his Church.

We may next notice, that "rabble charming word," HERESY, HERETIC: this is never used in the N. T. merely for false doctrine, or for those who hold it: it does not mean error: and if it did, those who charge others with it, should prove out of the Bible, that they have the truth. In general, heresy means, a sect or school in philosophy, as a denomination in religion. And amongst the Jews, there was the heresy of the Pharisees, of the Sadducees, &c. But those heresies or denominations, all were inside the Jewish Church, and worshipped in the same temple. And so we have in the English Church, the Media Via Heresy, or Puseyite sect; the Evangelical heresy, or self-styled gospel sect: with many others, of every shade: so that heresy like schism, does not imply separation. In

* Whence all Mosaic rules and principles belong only to the Jews.

the N. T. the term heretic is mentioned in one place with disapprobation; though in many other places without it: the Christians were called a sect, the men of that HERESY, "that way," or persuasion. But in (Titus iii. 10, 11.) we read, "the man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself." This evidently does not refer to one who has left a communion, but to a factious disturber of the Church he is a member of:—not a separatist, but one who sticks like a thorn in the sides of that community he belongs to, and still disobeys and disturbs. Any society or club, has a right to out-vote such a factious member; who makes himself a nuisance. But what has this to do with those who go out of a communion?—nothing at all. "A man that is a heretic reject," therefore Churchmen are to reject a Dissenter!—this is a strange confusion of dates, for he has already rejected you.

Heresy and schism then, are sins inside a Church, by members of it, and consequently cannot be committed by one independent Church against another. Dissenters then are not, and cannot be schismatics against the Church of England. But the parties inside are schismatics: the Evangelicals, who oppose strongly the Puseyites, and the Puseyites who oppose the Evangelicals: whilst both parties are heretics, being condemned of themselves, in taking only one part of the teaching of the Church: one the forms, and the other the articles: so that if *they* left who do not take in the whole Church doctrines, neither party could remain. They both forfeit their title, by not being like their Articles and Prayer Book,—both Papists and Protestants at the same time.

Nor are we wrong in asserting that such persons are true heretics, in the condemnatory and Scriptural (Titus iii. 10, 11.) sense of that term: for first, they are within the Church, (which is an essential feature:) secondly, they directly oppose many of the principles of that communion, in which they still remain: and thirdly, they are condemned of themselves: for in the declaration of the monarch's supremacy, it is commanded, "that no man hereafter shall either print or preach, to draw the article aside any way, but shall submit to it, in the full plain meaning thereof; and shall not put *his own sense or comment* to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in *the literal and grammatical sense*;" now those who in the face of this declaration, and in the teeth of common honesty, put a confessedly "non-natural sense," (*i. e.* their "own sense") "to be the meaning of the articles;"—who shift and twist them, in order to palliate the traitorous object of being enemies, whilst signing the "articles of peace," and giving the kiss of charity;—these shew by the very meanness of their evasions, that they are driven to extremities; that "being condemned of themselves," they will yet make the best of appearances; though their defence is as dishonest as their cause; and consistent with it: for the cause pawns their own integrity, and the defence saps the foundation of faith in general, by destroying the integrity of language, and so turning treaties into clouds, which are driven about by the four winds of heaven. These then are heretics in the full and true sense of the term, who as Puseyites, adduce "non-natural" senses; and as Evangelicals fly to "prevenient grace;" "hypothetical" and "charitable" constructions, &c. It is vain therefore, for the Church to

look *outside* herself for heretics, since they are all within: and this despite supremacy and subscription.*

If we further regard the term heretic, etymologically, as meaning one who takes or chooses (his opinions,) and use it opprobriously in this meaning, we only crucify Protestantism under an ill name: for its essential principle is private judgment, that is, the right of forming and following our own opinions; which right, the name heresy reviles.† But *this* right and the right of remaining in a society, whose fundamental principles we attack and abhor;—these are different things; it is the “latter liberty,” which the clergy take, but which the nick-named schismatics (Dissenters) utterly scorn.

We have already entered too minutely into the meaning and application of certain party-names, to explain very fully the terms orthodox and heterodox: but these require only a little candour and attention. Orthodox, comes from orthos straight, upright, metaphorically right, true: and doxa opinion: and so means a person holding true opinions: but *who is to judge of their truth?* If indeed the strict etymology in these cases were attended to, much confusion would vanish; for the term doxa, means, that which appears true or best to some particular person: and would be expressed fully thus “as it appears *to me*.” but the person is left out; and in this contraction of language, there is an expansion of meaning: and so by omitting the qualifying part, it appears “*to me*,” we say “it appears;” *i. e.* is obviously true; in the eyes of all right-thinking persons. By this process, an individual opinion, is changed into an absolute and universal truth.

Heterodoxy, comes from doxa opinion, and heteros another: and therefore heterodoxy means another or a different opinion, and is literally a different opinion from that of other people: but in Church dialect means, an opinion differing from truth.

But to leave this minuteness,—orthodoxy is the right doctrine; that is, “my doctrine,” right in my estimation: heterodoxy is another doctrine; that is, some one else’s doxy; and therefore of course wrong (*in my estimation*.) Let no one therefore be deceived by such names, since it can be no proof of a doctrine to call it orthodox, for that is simply proving a thing, by saying that you believe it. “Whoever says differently,” and is willing to find truth and falsehood in names, “satisfies himself with words,” and misses the reality of things.

* “Let them (the Papists) go, then, and put an end to their own quarrels; unity and agreement do excellently become religion: yet, it is no certain and proper sign of the Church of God: for there was a wonderful agreement amongst them that worshipped the golden calf; and amongst those who cried with one voice, “crucify him, crucify him.”—*Bishop Jewel’s Apology*.

† This term is frequently applied by Roman Catholics, to the Church of England, and hence Jewel retorts, “it is customary with them, if any were for restoring religion, to look upon them immediately as innovators, and condemn them as heretics and factious persons.” And again, “we know that the word which was revealed by Christ, is sufficient to promote all truth, and to convince all heresies,”—“and not only so, but if any heresies happen to break out *anew* amongst us, (*i. e.* if any Dissenters arise, we are so far from cherishing heresy that) we severely and seriously correct the revivers of them, with lawful (!) civil punishments.”—“We do not like them, (the Papists,) presently betake ourselves to fire and sword, but to the Scriptures (*i. e.* the written or statute law?) nor do we assault with force of arms, but with the word of God.”—*Jewel’s Apology*.

The famous writer we have so often quoted, Dr. South, in paying court to tyranny, pays no great compliment to the people, who are claimed by the "poor man's Church;" witness the estimation in which they are held, —when daring to think for themselves:

"He who will set up (says our Author) for a skilful manager of the rabble, so long as they have ears to hear, need never enquire whether they have understandings whereby to judge; but with two or three popular empty words, as Popery and superstition, right of the subject; liberty of conscience, well tuned and humoured, may whistle them backwards and forwards, upwards and downwards, till he is weary, and get upon their backs when he is so." It seems from this, that liberty of conscience, and right of subjects, are empty names; and we perceive how necessary a Church is to those "poor men," who have no rights nor liberties; men who it seems are made to carry a rider, and be guided by a bit and bridle; and if any think so utterly mean of themselves, there is provided for them a Church, which recognizing neither reason nor conscience, is intended for such as want the attributes of man; and therefore is called the "poor man's" Church, because it is not fitted for MEN.

But setting aside this recrimination, we wish both high and low, to be no longer cheated by words; not even by such as—"our glorious constitution," "Church and king," "altar and hearth," "sword and mitre," "bible and crown," "laws of the land," "king's supremacy," "mother Church," "Heretics, Schismatics, Dissenters!"

"And therefore," in the words of our authority, we determined "to go over every one of these rabble-charming names, which carry so much wild-fire wrapped in them, and to lay open the true meaning and design of them, as distinctly as in so short an exercise we can." And we have done this, in the confident hope, that "the rabble" as they are nicknamed, will prove that liberty and conscience are no "empty names; and that they having an honest appeal to their reason, will shew that they have not only "ears to hear," but "understandings wherewith to judge."

But it will be objected, "what then, are we without any acknowledged and fixed standard of truth?" Not quite, for the Bible is as clear as any Church documents, and is the standard laid down by the wisdom of God: nor will Church Articles guard against divisions, for there is as much room for sects inside a Church, as out of it. And there might be found as great variety of opinions in the Church of England, or in the Church of Rome, as in all other Churches put together.

"But will not every imaginable schism and disorder arise, from this general license?" If different opinions constitute disorder, this has already arisen; and yet, Bishop Burnet, in expounding the XXXIX Articles, says, "it is certain they (to whom the Christian religion is revealed) are under an indispensable obligation to obey and follow that which is so graciously revealed to them; they are bound to follow it, according to what they are in their consciences persuaded is its true meaning." —not according to other persons' views.

As to the divisions that would thus arise, we should be no better off,

* South's I. Sermon, on the Fatal Imposture and Force of Words.

if each Government were allowed the supremacy in this question; since besides the differences inside an establishment, every country would have a different sort of establishment; and the majority would establish Heathenism. So that a national Churchman's view, only one monarchy (*i. e.* England) out of ninety-nine, would set up the right religion: and even this one, is wrong in four cases out of five: for though the Government of England is one, it has five religions; (a thing which seldom happens in private consciences) England helps Popery by Maynooth; (*and may help it more, as in olden time:*) dissent by the act of toleration (!) and the Regium Donum: Episcopacy in England: Presbyterianism in Scotland; all these, together with Wesleyanism in the Colonies; and may we not add, Juggernaut, to this English pantheon? So that to whichever of these State-sanctioned parties you belong, you must feel that the State is heretical in sanctioning the others; for it "ought to support the *right* religion," which of course is your's.

Behold then, how erratic royal consciences are. "Shall we then have no unity?" Yes! We cannot avoid this; all true Christians are one in Christ: but it is *union* we require; that is, the recognition of each other as fellow members of one body, the Catholic Church, of which Christ alone is the head. We cannot have this union, so long as we follow the phantom of "uniformity;" but only as we aim after the unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace.

And whence do all these bickerings arise? From the love of freedom? Are Dissenters, and rights-of-conscience-men, to be charged with these divisions? No: but those who in seeking to compress all men into one iron enclosure, lead to violent reaction, and are thus the cause of those dissensions which they condemn.

And what is the chimera, which leads men into this phrenzy of intolerance? It is the fiction of "uniformity:" it is that strangely besotted fancy, which gives to a fraction of Christ's servants the name, "The Church," and thus, "by a wretched sham, deluding mankind." It is the setting up of this idol, "The Church," personifying ministers into a holy mother, and imitating the chivalry of the crusades, fighting to the tune of "God and the Ladies;" not chaunting the "soul-inspiring, lyre-sung, Mary-Epic;" but deifying a fancy, and worshipping an abstraction. This is the grand heresy of the age, (if we may retain the ecclesiastical use of that term)—not Mariolatry, the worship of Mary; but ecclesiatry, the worship of a Church; instead of the Church's Saviour. For "The Church" is the Puseyite's Virgin Mary: and the Evangelical assists at the same altar: what then shall abase this lofty one; and lowering these pretensions, elevate all Christians to the level of unity, under the sceptre of Christ? Nothing but some powerful Eiconoclastes, who shall break this image, strip the bauble of its trappings and shew men that this adoration of a Church, is only the exaltation of a clergy, "which exalteth itself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped: so that it as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing itself that it is God:" (2 Thess. ii. 4.) that stands to the world as the only representative of heaven, through which all blessings descend, and by which alone paradise can be gained.

By what power then shall this idol fall, and men's thoughts become

emancipated? By the arm of him whose place it occupies:—carry up the ark of the Lord, and Dagon will fall before it, vanishing before the brightness of the Saviour's coming; slain by "the sword of his mouth,"—by the force of that truth, which breaking the chains of error and slavery, will make all his people free.

"ON THE MASSACRE OF PIEDMONT.*

Avenge O Lord thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold;
Ev'n them who kept thy truth so pure of old,
When all our father's worshipp'd stocks and stones,
Forget not: in thy book record their groans
Who were thy sheep, and in their ancient fold
Slain by the bloody Piedmontese, that roll'd
Mother with infant down the rocks. Their moans
The Vales redoubled to the hills, and they
To heaven. Their martyr'd blood and ashes sow
O'er all the Italian fields where still doth sway
The triple tyrant; that from these may grow
A hundred fold, who, having learned thy way,
Early may fly the Babylonian woe."

TO CYRIACK SKINNER.

CYRIACK, this three years deny these eyes, though clear,
To outward view, of blemish or of spot,
Bereft of light, their seeing have forgot;
Nor to their idle orbs doth sight appear
Of sun, or moon, or star, throughout the year,
Or man, or woman. Yet I argue not
Against Heaven's hand or will, nor bate a jot
Of heart or hope; but still bear up and steer
Right onward. What supports me, dost thou ask?
The conscience, friend, to have lost them overplied
In liberty's defence, my noble task,**
Of which all Europe rings from side to side.
This thought might lead me through the world's vain mask
Content though blind, had I no better guide.

* This massacre occurred in the year 1685, when Milton, as the Latin Secretary, wrote in Cromwell's name to the Duke of Savoy (the instigator of this Catholic scourge) and many others on behalf of the persecuted Protestants. Milton, not satisfied with writing as Secretary those noble letters, has left this memento of his sympathy and Roman baseness.

** Milton's *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano*,—Defence of the English people.

IV.

SCEPTICS' RELIGION.

Under this department, sceptical objections, and systems or principles advocated as hostile to Christianity, are dispassionately considered.

The Passages in the Life of an Enquirer, to be continued in our next.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF AN ATHEIST.*

(Continued from page 334.)

WE left Mr. Holyake conducting his defence, extracting tears from his audience, by that touching recital of the fourpenny Evangelical Rector's godly walk and conversation; as he, by his myrmidons, walked into the house of mourning, not with God's blessing, not with Christ's loving spirit, but with the State's curse and the Redeemer's disgrace, a legal engine of one-clergy power, to take the bed from under a suffering and dying child, or the bread and water from its mouth.

And all this, for what? to save souls? No: to get fourpence. And by whom? Not by an inquisitor, but a mild, loving, and Evangelical rector, whose condescending lenity to the Dissenters is still the theme of his successors! Happily things are somewhat altered, even in this brief space of time, and no clergyman, however bland and pharisaical, dare perpetrate the same outrage, but all church-rates and Easter fourpences have died out, in the town where this melancholy circumstance occurred;† and they are safely buried in the consecrated ground of growing freedom, in the sure and certain hope of no resurrection. It is not because Christianity is dying out, that these abuses can no longer live; but because men are becoming Christians, and learning the lessons of Christ,—to repeat his rebukes against the pretenders to his mission, (whose words are honey, and whose deeds are vinegar mingled with gall)—“woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers.”—(Matt. xxiii. 14.)

Leaving these men to their “dues,” we return to our Atheist and his trial.

We have already pointed out the fallacies involved in that intemperate and “indecorous” speech which occasioned his prosecution, that there

* The History of the Last Trial by Jury for Atheism. A Fragment of Autobiography. By George Jacob Holyoake.

† Though Church-rates still linger in the suburbs, at Edgbaston, Handsworth, &c. where annual seizures are made,

need have been no reference to God, since what argument it contained made against a State taxation for religion, and had nothing to do with either the Deity or Christianity.

That such was really the only proper force of his remarks, is partly acknowledged and sufficiently implied by Mr. Holyoake himself in his address to the Jury.

"But it has been stated, I said I would put the Deity on half-pay. After first stating that I did not believe there was a Deity, is it likely I should say I would put him on half-pay? Would you put a servant on half-pay whom you never hired or had? *All my expressions went to prove that I referred to the expenses of religion.* I could not suppose that there is a being capable of governing the world, and consider him good and kind, and yet have any intention of bringing him into contempt. *I had no personal reference to the Deity.* I made use of that *figure of speech* because I thought that they would understand it better, and they did understand it. I was saying, we had many heavy burdens to pay to capitalists and others, and that I thought it hung like a millstone round us. Sir R. Peel said, when he introduced the income-tax, that the poor man could bear no more. I said there were twenty-four millions taken from us for the support of religion, and they would do well to reduce *that* one-half.

"Mr. Holyoake, on resuming, said—'according to a calculation that has never been disputed, the

			Pay to their clergy.
Catholics, numbering.....	124,672,000	...	£6,106,000
Protestants ,, 	54,046,000	...	11,906,000
Greek Church ,, 	41,000,000	...	760,000
Total of Christians 		219,718,000	£18,762,000

"Of which England, for twenty-one millions of people, pays more than one-half. Thus the English pay five times more according to their numbers—I proposed a reduction of one-half.

"Mr. W. J. Fox has told us—'if the Government of the country disposed of the mismanaged funds of the clergy, they would have sufficient for their annual needful expenditure.

"Mr. Justice Erskine. If you can convince the jury that your only meaning, was that the incomes of the clergy ought to be reduced, and that you did not intend to insult God, I should tell the jury you ought not to be convicted. You need not go into a laboured defence of that."

Here we submit to Mr. Holyoake that he made a grand mistake in not accepting the suggestion of Mr. Justice Erskine, who saw plainly the only proper force of Mr. Holyoake's argument. Suppose then that instead of any further defence, the *prisoner* had repeated the words immediately preceding,—"*I referred to the expenses of religion; I had no personal reference to the Deity;*" or in the words of the Judge "*I did not intend to insult God,*" but meant "*that the incomes of the clergy should be reduced;*"—there would have been an end to the trial, and he would have been acquitted.

This would have been perfectly in accordance with his own argument

in his defence, and would have saved him six months imprisonment; whereas the rest of his speech was thrown away, by the strange oversight of this favourable and honourable opportunity of escape.

"After a very brief deliberation" (at the end of an eleven hours' speech, the last seven of which lost the cause) "the jury returned a verdict of guilty."

The Judge summed up, declaring that "if these words had been *written* for deliberate circulation, I should have passed on you a severer sentence. You uttered them in consequence of a question—I have no evidence that this question was put to draw out these words. Proceeding on the evidence that has been given, trusting that these words have been uttered in the heat of the moment, I shall think it sufficient to sentence you to be *imprisoned in the common gaol for six calendar months.*"

We must now beg our readers to accompany Mr. Holyoake to *gaol* AFTER THE SENTENCE, that they may learn the efficient legal way of refuting Atheism.

"As soon as the sentence was pronounced, I was taken to the cells under the court. Captain Mason, the governor, said there was another prisoner to go down besides me and Adams. It was a case of felony. He said 'would I go with him?' I replied, 'I would not.' He then asked, if I 'objected to go with Adams.' That I cheerfully agreed to, and, handcuffed with Adams, I walked down to the gaol. Having taken nothing since morning but a little raspberry vinegar, with which Mr. Carlile supplied me, I began to feel weak, but nothing was offered me except a little warm water, for which I asked, and this, with a very hard and bitter apple, constituted my supper. The transition from the excitement of the court, to the darkness and coolness of the night cell, made me feel as if going into a well, and my supper not serving to compose me, I continued restless till the morning."

Compulsory gaol prayers, were the next acquirement attempted to be thrust down the throat of the prisoner, in which religion must have appeared extremely amiable, since as the gaol chapel chaplain observed, "we think there is a *divine* influence in prayer which might operate upon you," though the answer he received shewed that his advantage over the prisoner from a *human* influence, was in every respect a disadvantage: and hence in reply to this hope of divine influence in prayer, the prisoner answered very truly and cuttingly,—"*not in THIS PLACE.*"

The scene is very graphically given in "the History of the Trial for Atheism."

"On the second morning after my sentence, I was sitting by the (very little) fire in the common room, contemplating, with very critical air, a can of somewhat indifferent gruel, which I had not the slightest disposition to eat, *when the prayer bell rung*, which did not at all improve my temper. Where the gaol was situated, I enjoyed such a propinquity to dock bells, basin bells, cathedral bells, and gaol bells, that had I been inclined to *rebel*, it would have chimed in with the others. Upon the aforesaid prayer bell ringing, all my fellow prisoners made a rapid escape. I could not tell what had become of them. Over my head was a large grating, for the convenience of gaolers overlooking the room. Down this grating there came a tremendous voice, shouting 'Holyoake! Holy-

oake! Holyoake!" The voice belonged to Ogden, a man whom Carlyle would have delighted to honour. Nature made him for a gaoler. Looking up, I said, 'what do you want?"

"Did you not hear that bell?"

"Yes," I said; 'what of that?"

"All the other prisoners are gone to prayers."

"Well, let the poor devils go, if they like it."

"I can't be talked to in this way," he roared out, in his surliest tones; 'you must go.'

"I am afraid that is a mistake of yours."

"Don't you know where you are?"

"Yes; I am in Gloucester gaol, sitting over a can of very bad gruel."

"Don't you know you are a prisoner?"

"Oh! yes; I am quite sensible of it."

"Well, you must do as the others do, and you must go to prayers."

"Then you must carry me."

"I'll report you to the clergyman."

"Give the clergyman my compliments, and say I'm not coming to prayers."

He stalked away with the air of one whose dignity was greatly outraged. During the time of this colloquy, prayers were suspended, and the clergyman was waiting my arrival, in order to begin.

"As soon as prayers were well over, an order came for me—the clergyman wanted me."

"Well, Mr. Holyoake," he said, when I met him, 'how is it you did not come to prayers?"

"I answered, 'You cannot expect me to come to prayers; you imprison me here on the ground that I do not believe in a God, and then you would take me to chapel to pray to one. I cannot prevent your imprisoning me, but I can prevent your making me a hypocrite, and must.'

"But if you attended the ordinances of grace, it might lead you to believe in the Christian religion."

"I should be very sorry for that."

"Really me—how can you say so, sir?"

"Because I should be very sorry to treat those who differ from me as you treat me."

"You do not understand us. It is not you we persecute—it is your opinions."

"Then I wish you would imprison my opinions, and not me."

Here he turned to refresh himself by looking at the rules for the regulation of prisoners in Gloucester gaol. He resumed—

"But you must attend prayers—it's the rule of the gaol."

"I must do what I must do, I know; but, if I do that, I must be carried into chapel every morning, and that will not edify the remainder of your congregation. What can I do if I go? I could not say, 'O Lord I have erred and strayed like a lost sheep.' You see yonder gratings? I am not likely to err and stray, for the next six months, beyond those bars."

"Ah! that is not what we mean."

"Then what do you mean? Can I join with those men in saying,

'O Lord, who hath given us grace with one accord to make our common supplications unto thee,' when I shall make no supplications unless forced to it? You know the prisoners only go because the turnkey is behind them?" Then I showed him the passage, 'we have done those things which we ought not to have done,' &c., and asked him what I had done, or had the chance of doing, wrong, since I came there? At this he was puzzled a little, and he at last answered—

"Ah! but we think there is a divine influence in prayer, which might operate upon you."

"*'Not in this place,'* I answered, *'where it is so much contradicted by your practice.* I will agree to this, that when on Sundays you preach, and I may hear something new, I will come."

"He ended the colloquy after a *very Christian manner*, by saying, *'well, if you don't come to prayers, you shall be locked up.'*

"I answered, 'well sir, give your orders.' I need scarcely say this was done, in one form or other, to the end of my imprisonment. Sometimes I was locked in my sleeping cell, but generally in the day room; but I found it more agreeable than the litany, and I never asked for any alteration. I went to chapel only on Sunday, (the preaching day), but never to the week-day prayers.

"Offensive regulations were often sought to be applied to me. One was an attempt to make me wear the prison dress. I said I preferred my own clothes. The answer was, the rules were imperative, and they must enforce them. I inquired whether they had any spare time on their hands, for it would be necessary to dress me every morning. My answer was reported to the magistrates, and I heard no more of the project."

Six months petty persecutions superadded to the necessary rigour and degradation of confinement in a gaol, would sour the best temper, and tend to embitter the most generous disposition: and when we consider the weakness of our nature, how much we are the creatures of impulse, how frequently our feelings give the colour to our judgment, we cannot wonder that one who all along *regarded this treatment as a feature of Christianity* should come out of gaol an inveterate enemy of that religion.

The private and deeper wounds endured by Mr. Holyoake, in the loss of a beloved child during his hard imprisonment, whilst awakening in him all the finer and more hallowed feelings of bereaved affections, turned even these better impulses of our nature, (which God sends to soften us and open our hearts for the oil and wine of the gospel,) into vinegar mingled with gall to be offered in revenge to the Redeemer himself, who was verily guiltless of Holyoake's sufferings and hath doubtless received that child under his loving and eternal guardianship.

But before we enter into that melancholy yet beautiful history, we must disturb the current of our feelings, by one more *prison view*, the final attempt to convert a man who had lost his liberty, a father who had lost his child,—lost her through imprisonment, which prevented his care and necessary provisions;—*lost because in all England there was not feeling enough among infidels to support the little family of the man who was suffering in their cause.*

A hundred thousand hearts in the religious public, would have pre-

vented this catastrophe, had the case been brought before them; but the infidel portion, Mr. Holyoake's friends, knew it well enough, and therefore had no excuse for their shameless supineness in such a cause.

But this supineness and want of all human affections in the friends of infidelity, we shall have to notice afterwards, we now hasten to the final effort of conversion, WHICH IS A LIFE-LIKE PICTURE OF A STATE RELIGION; and some painter who loves his liberty, and has a sacred reverence for the Redeemer, would immortalize his genius, by presenting a picture of the gaol chaplain in his pulpit, *the prisoner leaning on the spikes*, "not inapt emblems of such Christian love."

"The final efforts for my conversion were on this wise. The Rev. Mr. Cooper sent for me, a few days before my liberation, and asked me to follow him to the chapel. Arrived there, he ascended the pulpit, motioning me to a *prisoner's* pew without even asking me to be seated. My neck was stiff with a severe cold, and I was as ill able as ill disposed to be catechised. I stood leaning on the spikes—not inapt emblems of *such* Christian love as I had *there* been made acquainted with. The good chaplain prayed—I did not move. He looked at me to catch my eye—I kept mine fixed on the spikes. He addressed me—I made no sign. He spoke some minutes—still I remained motionless. He paused, and asked what I thought of his representations—I answered no word. He seemed to think he had made a favourable impression. He resumed and came to another peroration, and again besought me to answer—still no motion, no word from me. He began a third time, and touched all serious topics which he could command, and came again to an elaborate peroration on death-beds; and as I remained still silent and immoveable, he said, somewhat perplexed this time, 'Holyoake, won't you speak?' I then answered, '*not while we occupy these places*. Do you not preach to me, and place me here where prisoners stand? I take this to be a ceremony, and not a conversation.' He walked down from his pulpit and asked me to accompany him, when he took me into several cells, till he found one warmed with hot air, and asked, would I speak to him there on friendly terms? I answered, 'with pleasure;' and there we conversed for the last time. I troubled him to repeat his arguments, as I would not admit that I had attended to a word. When he had done, I briefly assured him that *my experience there had not created in me any desire to be a Christian*: he had brought before me no new evidences, and as it had been found necessary to enforce those I knew before, by penal reasons, the operation had *rather diminished their weight, in my estimation*."

Have not "*the legal and constitutional*" friends of Christianity gained to themselves immortal honour, in thus filling the mouth of Atheism with arguments drawn from their own faithlessness in Christ? Are these "the weapons of their warfare, which are not carnal but mighty through God?" And whilst these men, like Judas, betray Christ into the hands of chief priests, and Scribes, and the Gentiles; we appeal to the honesty, the candour, and truthfulness, of even professed infidels, whether they ought to join in this crusade against a spotless name, and charge upon Jesus Christ and his religion, a conduct abhorrent to his spirit, and totally condemned in the New Testament in his blood.

THE DOMESTIC SUFFERINGS of Mr. Holyoake, in the loss of his child, during his imprisonment, (an apt conclusion to the loss of his sister during the payment of the rector's fourpence and the cost of the summons),* implicating "the Apostles of forethought" in the guilt of an unpardonable neglect, will be read with the deepest sympathy. "About this time an event occurred in my family, which converted my imprisonment into an unexpected bitterness." "When I came to leave home to go to my trial, all was calm and cheerful as usual, though there was much around to suggest uneven thoughts.

"On that day no one came to accompany me or to spend an hour of solace with those from whom I parted. Had there been a single friend present to have made up the appearance of society after I was gone, the loneliness would have been less bitter." As I left the house I heard that cry break forth which had been suppressed that it might not sadden my departure. Before I had proceeded far up Windsor Street, Ashted, I was arrested by Madeline's silvery voice calling 'good bye, dada,' and turning round I saw her large bright black eyes (which every body praised) peering like two stars round the lintel of the door. I am glad I did not then know that I should never hear that voice again, nor see those bright eyes any more.

"After a few weeks of my imprisonment had passed away, hint-words came of Madeline's failing health. Out of some money sent by my private friends, John Fowler and Paul Rodgers, of Sheffield, to buy better food than the gaol afforded, I saved a guinea and sent it to Birmingham, to purchase Madeline a winter cloak—it was spent in buying her a coffin. Though of perfect health and agility, she was one of those children who require entire preservation from exposure, want, or fatigue. *On ten shillings per week, which was all that the Anti-Persecution Union could provide, this could not be done, as Eveline, then in arms, left her mother no opportunity of increasing that small income.* Cold succeeded cold, when want of more means caused them all to go to live in a house ill ventilated, and where several were ill of fever, which soon attacked Madeline.

Mr. Chilton sent me several intimations to prepare for the worst, should it happen. But I could not believe in the worst happening, and indeed I had yet to realize what the worst implied. At length, one morning the heavy corridor door grated on its harsh hinges, and the morose turnkey—fit messenger of misery—put a letter into my hand. As it had been, as usual broken open—for there is no feeling, not even that of affection and death, respected in a gaol—Ogden knew its contents, and in justice to him, I must say he endeavoured, as well as one whose ability lay in his moroseness, could, to speak a word of apology and sympathy. The strangeness and awkwardness of the attempt drew my attention to the fatal black border, which gave me sensations such as I never received before, and never shall again, for the first death of one dear to you, like that of the first love, brings with it a feeling which is never repeated. I remember that some prisoner came and covered me with a coat, for I had walked into the yard without one. Captain Mason and two friends

* See page 334 of our preceding number.

came round, but I could not speak to them. He addressed a few words to me, but I turned away.

"Then Madeline had died the death of the poor; *she had perished among the people who know neither hope nor comfort*, a pledge that I shall never forsake those with whose sad destiny one so dear to me is linked. Though in the death of poverty there is nothing remarkable, though hundreds of children are daily killed off in the same way, yet parents unused to this form of calamity, find in it, the first time, a bitterness which can never be told.

"The ten shillings per week income of the family *was made up by small subscriptions by some who knew me, and by a few outside* who happened to think useful the course I had taken. *One or two friends whose professions had beforetime been profuse, Eleanor met. They were cold, or to her they seemed so.* She thought they feared a continued acquaintance might lay them under some tax to contribute to her support. This she could never bear. Offering her hand to one, who did not take it, she went home, and nothing induced her to subject herself to such suspicion any more.

'My dada's coming to see me,' Madeline exclaimed on the night of her death, with that full, pure, and thrilling tone which marked her when in health. 'I am sure he is coming to night, mamma,' and then remembering that that could not be, she said, 'write to him mamma, he will come to see me;' and these were the last words she uttered—and all that remains now, is the memory of that cheerless, fireless room, and the midnight reverberation of that voice which I would give a new world to hear again.

"For her father, he was debating in incoherence the vain proposition as to whether he could prevail on the Governor to let him go home for one night, to smooth and watch over that dying pillow, and he would cheerfully and gratefully have expiated the privilege by six or twelve months' additional imprisonment."

Men of such amiable and honourable natural feelings, cannot be embittered against the gospel of Christ, except by a course of perverse unchristian treatment; which abuses their reason, takes away the calmness of their judgment, and leads them by such unfavourable prejudices to see the Saviour, though pure and bright as the sun, rise blood red because of the vitiated atmosphere of human mists and exhalations.

Mr. Holyoake himself declares, that *he was not an Atheist, till his friend Southwell was imprisoned for Atheism*; and it was on the occasion of his journey to visit Southwell in gaol, that he made the unfortunate speech, at Oheltenham; the most foolish part of which was not put in the indictment, and was evidently the result of exasperation, not of reason.—"for myself, I flee the Bible as a viper, and revolt at the touch of a Christian:"—he was thinking of the magistrate's Bible, and the Bristol turnkey; neither of which are either documents or officers of Christ's religion.

It was during Mr. Holyoake's imprisonment, and in excitement and anger at the outrage, that Mr. Chilton wrote in the *Oracle* an insult on the Saviour, for selling which Mr. Adams (who after the trial was hand-

cuffed with Holyoake) was also sent to the house of *correction*, though only for a month.

The sentence was softened for two reasons, first, his lawyer repented for him, and secondly, he was not the author, but only the seller of the piece in question.

We introduce the passage here, in order to exhibit more fully the *excess of anger against Christ and Christianity*, with which these men were betrayed by *unchristian* persecution; and the *perverted understanding* with which they libelled the most benevolent character and system ever seen by man.

"The passage from No. 25 of the *Oracle*, for which Adams was indicted, was written by my friend Mr. Chilton, who was outraged at my imprisonment, and ran as follows:—

"What else could be expected of men who deify a real or imaginary individual, a compound of ambition and folly, of mock humility and rampant tyranny; who, though called the 'Prince of Peace,' declared he came to bring a sword in the world? This *hellish mission* he performed to perfection, for never since his time has blood and misery ceased to flow from his dogmas and mysteries."

The ignorance of this attack on the character of Christ is amazing; the utter misapprehension of the meaning of his words, "I come not to send peace but a sword," can only be explained by the fixed idea (nothing less than monomania) that everything done under the pretence of religion, is to be charged on the Saviour.

It must surely be unnecessary to explain to our readers what Christ meant by sending a sword, setting father against son, daughter against mother; viz., that he should present a truth to men, for the love of which, they would sacrifice and endure all things.

That he would not hush up matters, and cry peace, when falsehood was enthroned; but *set up the standard of conscience, truth and principle; for which men should SUFFER, NOT FIGHT; endure evils, not inflict them.*

It is not *from* his dogmas, that blood has flowed; but *in opposition to his principles of ABSOLUTE UNLIMITED FREEDOM from every master on earth.*

It is a disgrace to the understanding of any man, to pervert so plain a truth, and see in the Prince of Peace, only the accomplisher of a hellish mission: every word of Mr. Chilton's is false and libellous, and we trust that by this he has had time to cool, and repent of this injustice.

Certainly the imprisonment of Adams would not contribute to this reasonable temper of mind.

But Mr. Holyoake has furnished us with a simple illustration, by which he and his friends may see in what way Christ sent a sword.

In his elegant apostrophe to liberty, we see how even liberty herself has also carried a sword, and walked on over the graves of men; not that she put men to death, but that they died in her cause.

Now the greatest sufferers for liberty, have been sufferers for Christ, under the despotism of those who have too often usurped Christ's name.

Read then the address to liberty, written immediately after the description of Madeline's death, and say whether *liberty or her opponents* are to be charged with carrying on a blood-thirsty and hellish mission; and in

reading this passage, *for* LIBERTY PUT CHRIST, who is the champion of liberty, and its true author.

"O liberty! whom the nations welcome with triumphant shouts, whom all to whom the world owes its progress have worshipped—over how many graves hast thou walked! Rising with the morning's dawn, making all people radiant with thy presence, the poet thrills as thy chariot is borne on the sun's golden beams, and he hails thee as a goddess, and blesses thee as a bride, and sings of thy triumphs and benefactions! But those who serve thee—who make their lives a sad and desert waste that thy pathway through the world may be unobstructed—who kneel to thee in their dungeon-churches, and pour out the incense of life's young warm blood at gibbet-altars: *they know thee by thy gory garments, dripping with the blood of the father and the tear of the orphan, and the desolation which precedes thy progress. The anthems of thy march are hollow voices from Siberia's mines, and Vincennes' cells—the wail of women under the Russian knout, the groans of Konarski, and the whistle of bullets which slay the Bandiera and Blum—thy trophies are the fresh graves of Hungary and Rome, thy throne is on a hecatomb of earth's noblest and bravest sons. Yet art thou still sacred in the eyes of man.* Queen of genius and progress! emblem of that suffering through which humanity is purified and developed! Thou hast trodden on the grave of my child, and *I worship thee still*, although thou mayst yet tread on my own."

Are we then to abjure liberty as a tyrant, because in her interests men have suffered,—then in like manner traduce him whose constitution of freedom has called forth so many swords of tyrants from their scabbards, to flesh themselves on his faithful and self-sacrificing followers!

It was thus that Christ sent a sword on the earth, and caused divisions, as he inspired men with principle to withstand the tyranny of office and power, noble men whose courage and endurance exasperated kings and governors, and braved the dungeon, the lions, the stake, fines, banishments, civil disabilities,—all forms of oppression and indignity.

Such men were the Apostles of our Lord; his confessors and martyrs; such were our Protestant, Puritan, and Nonconformist forefathers, to whose sufferings both Infidels and Christians owe their present liberties.

Notwithstanding these sufferings in his name, who has given us the freedom to "call no man master, on earth," we do not upbraid him, but say with our Author, "yet thou art still sacred in the eyes of man,—KING of genius and progress, emblem (*and instance*) of that suffering by which humanity is purified and developed:—*we worship thee STILL.*"

(*To be continued.*)

REVIEWS AND CRITICISMS.

The Cross and the Crucifix ; or, Popery, what it is, and how to repress it. By the Rev. R. S. SHORT. London: B. L. Green. Lincoln: Charles Akkrill.

This instructive and well-written pamphlet, contains the substance of a Lecture delivered before the members and friends of the "Lincoln Young Men's Mutual Improvement Society;" and is published at the request of the audience.

Much information is condensed into a short space, and in a readable style, fairly answering the title—"Popery, what it is:" whilst the principles advocated, shew that the Lecturer understands the true methods of "repressing" Popery.

Such principles are required, not only for meeting naked Popery, but to become the *salt* of our cathedral towns.

Popish Intolerance. Is the imposition of salutary restrictions upon Popery, inconsistent with the principles of religious toleration? By the Rev. Verner M. WHITE, A.B. Minister of the Presbyterian Church, Islington, Liverpool. London: Ward and Co.

Mr. White has adduced abundant evidence of the intolerance of Rome; but no proofs that there are any such things as "*salutary* restrictions;" his attempt would have been more satisfactory had he not looked at Rome in the light of the late papal agitation question; in which men have aimed at words, while they have missed realities. The only *salutary* restrictions we can conceive of, are such as shall defend the property of the dying, and the liberty of the living. The priests may, for aught we care, call themselves any fine name they please, providing they be checked by the force of law, from unjust and tyrannical dealings with the property and liberties of men. We refer to religious bequests and *religious* (!) houses.

Mr. White has joined in the infatuated supposition that such Protestants as do not agree with the legislation against the assumption of a cardinalate, "*can see no harm in Popery*;" this is a vile and shameless calumny: when will this class of controversialists learn that truth and candour are due to opponents?

After quoting part of the Romish canon law, which confiscates to the Church, all the possessions of heretics, he observes—"this glorious code, *now the law of England*, which *only* lacks the power to enforce it," &c.

But what sort of a law of England is that which "*only* lacks the power" of enforcement?

This unfortunate admission, shews at once the folly of being terrified at nominal laws; the rules of the Romish Church can never touch us till they are *the laws of the land*; and they will never attain to this dignity by any Bull from Rome. They are *not* now the law of England.

In reply to the very natural objection, that "all Churches have persecuted when they have had the power, and therefore, Rome is not worse than others," Mr. White observes, that "the principles of a Church are to be drawn from her standards," and boldly enquires, "will the advocate of Rome open up the standards of Protestant Churches, and fix on one passage authorizing persecution?"

"I have given such passages from the standards of Rome, *I challenge the Papist to give one solitary passage from ours.*"

We have not the Presbyterian standards at hand, but our memory is very treacherous or we have seen some rather strong assertions in them, respecting the *sword of the Magistrate*; even as far as the death of idolators.

Whilst of this we are fully certain, that this opponent of Roman canon law, must be completely ignorant of the canons of the English Church; which are *standards*, and the Romanist could open up and quote them, so as to astonish Mr. White. It is a pity he puts the controversy on so dangerous an issue.

Notwithstanding these defects and serious mistakes, the work contains much valuable information respecting the intolerance of Rome, deduced from authorized sources.

Faith and Order. Hints to Candidates for Church Fellowship. By the Rev. J. S. PEARSALL, Bristol. London: J. SNOW.

This is an able and clear exposition of Church principles; and is admirably adapted to the minds of enquirers. It is a convenient little Manual to be put into the hands of such, to guide them in the most important crisis of their spiritual experience. It would be well if the wealthier members of our congregations would place such books at the disposal of ministers and deacons, for gratuitous distribution.

Scripture Subjects, put into simple verse for the Young. By EDWARD MILLER. London: John Snow.

This little book is divided into three parts, in each of which, a variety of Scriptural topics is discussed, every subject being discussed in a separate verse.

"Part I. The Characters of Jesus Christ.

Part II. Scripture Characters.

Part III. Various Subjects and Hymns."

The verses are headed with a Scriptural reference; our readers will best understand the nature of the work, and may judge of its execution, by an average specimen from "Part I. the Characters of Jesus."

"ADVOCATE.

(1 John ii. 1; Hebrews vii. 25.)

See how he stands and pleads with God,
For those for whom he shed his blood;
Nor will he ever cease t' implore,
Till they shall need his prayers no more."

Sermons for the Times. Discourses on the Leading Questions of the Age, in regard to Religion. By the Rev. PROFESSOR THOLUCK, of Halle. Translated from the German, by W. FARRER, LL.D. London: Ward and Co.

The first of this series of discourses, entitled "*The Worth of Human Reason*," will repay perusal, especially as bringing out into prominence one side of a truth apt to be overlooked,—the influence of the moral feelings upon the judgment.

We hope the series will be encouraged; the first number is published at the small price of threepence; and is truly done out of German into English.

Confirmation neither Reasonable nor Scriptural, a Letter of Expostulation to the Rev. Francis Cunningham, Vicar of Lowestoft. By A CONFIRMED DISSENTER. London: Jarrold and Sons, St. Paul's Church-Yard.

We heartily wish that all vicars had such confirmed Dissenters under their cure. This cheap tract contains in twelve pages, a plain, Scriptural, and candid examination of the confirmation doctrine, as held and practised in the Establishment: it would do our friends the Evangelicals good to read it; and we trust it will have a wide circulation amongst Dissenters; such a tract should be largely distributed when confirmations are being enacted.

This Tract on Confirmation, is a fitting successor to one formerly noticed in our pages, written, as we suppose, by the same author, entitled "*Protestant Priestism, &c.*"

The writer would do well to print all his tracts of a uniform size.

Auricular Confession and Popish Nunneries. By William HOGAN, formerly a Roman Catholic Priest. With Notes. Fifth Edition. London: Ward and Co.

This is certainly an extraordinary book; somewhat prolix in style, and intentionally rambling in the arrangement or non-arrangement of its topics.

We are quite at a loss how to review it; and can only say that if it be a true history (which only the enormity of its disclosures almost inclines us to doubt,) nothing in the shape of facts is more damaging to the character of the Romish priesthood: whilst nothing displays more forcibly the foolish and blind subservience of the faithful to their Shepherds.

The writer of this work, on abandoning the priesthood, entered into the profession of the law, in America, in which he attained to high distinction. Whilst amongst the priests, he had an excellent character from ecclesiastical dignitaries; and whatever they might say against him afterwards, (for they always try to kill the reputation of such as leave them, when they can do no more,) his good character was confirmed in his new profession: so that his word comes sufficiently accredited.

Popery and Puseyism Illustrated: A Series of Essays, with Appeals to the Sunday School Teachers of England. By John CAMPBELL, D.D. London: John Snow.

"The cry is *still they come*," bullets thick and fast, aimed at the power of the beast; an unexampled ardour in the defence of our Protestant principles, and vigorous aggression on the territory of Rome.

Dr. Campbell joins the ranks in this effective production, aiming to fulfil the desire expressed in his motto—"I wish I could breathe thunderclaps against the Pope and Popery; and that every word was a thunderbolt!"—*Luther*.

The work before us is mainly addressed to Sunday School Teachers; though of course equally adapted to Protestants in general.

Nor is the Dr. contented with this thunderbolt, another is already forged, and is about to be launched: this second work he tells us is already being revised for the press, and is to be entitled "*Popery, Ancient and Modern, &c.*" This more finished and complete work on Popery, is to contain thirty-six chapters, embracing the main points of the great controversy.

The numerous engagements of this indefatigable writer in his weekly and monthly productions, may well excite some surprise when they leave room for more considerable undertakings: we hail with much satisfaction, this illustration of "*Popery and Puseyism.*"

Providence and Prophecy; or God's hand fulfilling his word; more especially in the Revolutions of 1848, and subsequent events. By the Rev. William REES. London: H. Hughes. Liverpool: M. A. Jones.

Mr. Rees has presented us with an exceedingly interesting and instructive little volume, containing much important information, and abounding in enlightened principles. We heartily desire for it an extensive circulation.

The substance of this work, was originally delivered as Lectures, in the Author's native Welsh, and is here offered in good English.

The following are the Contents of the first Six Chapters:—

CHAP. I. General and Special Providence.

II. The Nature and causes of Revolutions, &c.

III. The Events of 1848 anticipated in Scripture; their character, &c. Russia, why formidable. The Creed of Despots, &c.

IV. A glance at the state of Europe, from the downfall of Napoleon to the present time; the Holy Alliance; Metternich, &c.

V. Commotions in Italy; Charles Albert; Pio Nono; Outbreak in Paris, &c.

VI. Louis Philippe's policy, intrigues, &c. Flight of the Pope and Cardinals.

There are six other chapters, but the above will be a sufficient intimation to our readers of the line taken up by Mr. Rees.

Whilst heartily welcoming this contribution to devout and liberal politics, we shall perhaps be singular in regretting that the Author did not leave "*the little horn*" in the Revelations, entirely to the possession of a different class of Protestants. We hope Mr. Rees will be encouraged to address the *English* public again.

I.

CHRIST'S RELIGION.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD." 1 Thess. v. 12.

THE TRUE APOSTLES' CREED;

OR THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON OF LIFE AND DOCTRINE, IN THE
PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST.

IN examining this important subject,—the canon or standard and test of religious truth and duty,—**TRUTH IN JESUS**, we have noticed the peculiarity of the rule, its actual adoption in the New Testament, and its fitness for the purpose intended.

We proceed in the next place to point out **SOME OF THE OBVIOUS DEDUCTIONS or lessons to be learned from the fact** of this peculiar, Scriptural, and appropriate standard.

Undoubtedly God had some wise purpose to answer, in adopting this particular, forcible, and attractive means of conveying his truth to mankind; the most prominent tendency and intention of which appears to have been *to preserve that truth pure from any foreign and base intermixture.*

This first purpose then was its preservation; the second its efficiency and purity.

Different methods have been adopted for the preservation of truths, facts, and evidence, amongst men; various memorials of events and depositories of doctrines to keep certain points in the memory of men; that they may be within our reach, and form materials of reference, for history, doctrine and commercial transactions.

The tradesman has his various books, as private records for his own satisfaction and that of his creditors: men possessing property, place *the truth of it* in title deeds and other legal instruments, which are deposited in a place of safety for future appeal, thus also *wills* are set down in writing and preserved for the purposes of defence and justice. All litigation is settled by an appeal to *the truth in these documents.*

The boundary stones of parishes and estates, answer the same important end: the foundation stone of a public edifice with the accompanying inscription, is to provide a permanent record of its intended purpose, and secure it to the uses of the party or for the opinions by which it was erected, or to which it was devoted.

Public monuments and inscriptions which are intended to commemorate great events, become points of reference for antiquarians; and like

medals, form the land-marks to later historians. Parliamentary and other journals are kept, manuscripts and books become the depositories of opinions and events, by a reference to which men may ascertain the propriety of assertions,—how far they are justified by the standards—as the truth is in these records.

Such are human methods of perpetuating opinions and truths concerning human affairs.

God also has a way of teaching truth by monuments and records; the monuments of the creation, the records of the Bible, and especially as exhibiting the character, teachings, and mission of Jesus Christ.

In the works of inanimate nature, we are provided with an unceasing display of divine power, wisdom, and goodness: in the harmonious movements of a vast and complicated machinery; in the evolutions of worlds upheld and carried along by an invisible hand: in the steady and unceasing processes of vegetation, of innumerable forms and inimitable beauty; fostered by the revolutions of the worlds on which the *seasons* depend: in animal life, teeming with variety and happiness and dependent for sustenance on the vegetable creation: in the spiritual, moral, and social nature of man, whose “understanding” is placed by the same power in the inward parts; an understanding to be employed for a while in this vast school, *where objects are lessons, and where realities are words*: in the wondrous providential arrangements of social life, by which men are collected into societies, and mutually supply each others wants; in the ties of home and kindred, nationalities, and the common sympathies of mankind.

All this constitutes the great monument of God's power and goodness; so that we can look nowhere with a clear eye, without seeing that in him we live and move. Thus is an invisible power ever enacting its wonders before us, placing truth in a series of facts of nature and providence.

And when men had by their inventions forgotten the Creator, so that they could no longer read his works by the light of his existence: no more interpret the signs of his eternal power and Godhead: he came forth again to put truth in the minds of prophets and other inspired men, by another method, namely, of supernatural communications: which should be written in a book and embodied in the emblems of the Mosaic religion; as symbolical rites hereafter to be explained—in the fulness of the times.

In nature, “God hath showed unto” the world many important truths, exhibited there in the concrete, as a visible embodiment of invisible things, so that what is not seen, might be made manifest through the signals which did appear: and consistently with this method of teaching by facts and events, God has taken a further step, to exhibit a clearer reflection of his glory, in the person of Jesus Christ; that as in nature are to be found the truths of God's natural attributes, and our relation to his temporal providence; so in Christ should be seen his moral attributes; our relation to his spiritual providence, as “God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself;” revealing the “brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person.”

Thus God who impersonally was manifested in nature, became personally “manifest in the flesh,” that he who seeth the Son, may see the Father.

And as science consists in tracing God's laws in Nature, so Christianity is an exhibition of the divine moral law in Jesus Christ.

After this manner is the truth *preserved*, in the clear outlines of a living character, a biographical lesson, truth expressed in a life. This security for preservation, forms also a security against any additions or admixture; since the rule we have described, affords in the first place, this general deduction, that nothing is to be regarded as Christian truth, which does not accord with this rule, and is not to be found in it.

This inference may be divided into several particulars: as (!) first, that the rule thus discovered renders invalid and unauthoritative all mere *verbal* CREEDS, as human compilations.

The truths contained in these creeds, or formal standards, are obligatory, not as being formed in these set forms of words, but as being deducible from the divine standard Jesus Christ, who is **THE TRUTH embodied**.

As an illustration of this point, we may examine that form of words, usually denominated "*the Apostles' Creed*," which is as follows:—

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth. And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified dead and buried. He descended into hell; the third day he arose again from the dead. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

"I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen."

This "form of sound words," as some would name it, is so extremely defective as a statement of Christian truth, that it has always appeared to us to be no compliment to the Apostles, to call it "*the Apostles' Creed*."

Though adopted by the Church of Rome, and from it by the Church of England, under this title as if Apostolical, it contains *only some of the HISTORICAL FACTS of Christianity*; not their moral meaning or significance; and *scarcely a SINGLE TRUTH* properly so called.

We are by it informed of God as the Creator, and Christ as the judge of the world; but *on what principles he will judge mankind*, it does not state, and therefore the information is of no value; it does not teach us how to prepare for the judgment; which is the only point of real consequence, and constitutes the real purpose of Christianity.

That Christ was born of Mary, crucified under Pilate, and raised from the dead, is an important series of historical facts,—but the truth and religion of a creed should say, *what he was born for, what he lived and died and rose for*: and what he is at the right hand of the Father for.

Without the explanation of these points, the facts serve no end, but the gratifying of historical curiosity. The mere statement that Christ ascended into heaven, is no more to us, than the statement that Elijah went up in a chariot of fire; the purpose of the Redeemer's death and resurrection is entirely omitted in this so-called Apostle's Creed.

The doctrine of "*the Holy Catholic Church*," is a suspicious element

of the creed, quite ambiguous in itself, and apparently introduced by some *exclusive priests*; whilst "the forgiveness of sins" is evidently intended to be associated with "communion of saints" in *this Church*; and is capable of employment for *priestly absolution*.

By what means, or on what principle, sins are forgiven, is entirely omitted; in other words, the central truth of the gospel forms no part of this creed.

"The life everlasting," is disconnected from its true source; and appears as a general *fact*, not as a *Christian truth* of life in Jesus Christ.

A Unitarian may subscribe to every word in this creed; it omits the atonement by the death of Christ; it omits justification by faith; it omits the intercession of Christ at God's right hand; IT DOES NOT ANSWER THE ONLY QUESTION THE GOSPEL CAME TO ANSWER,—*"what must I do to be saved?"*

Therefore it is not the Apostles' Creed, for that creed is in the New Testament, and declares "FIRST OF ALL that Christ died for our sins," that "he was delivered for our offences and raised again to justify our hope in his death;" that he has *entered heaven for us*, and ever liveth to make intercession for us; that we are reconciled by his death and shall be saved by his life. These things which constitute the essence of Christianity, are omitted in this so-called Apostles' Creed

The truth that is in Jesus, and which the Apostles preached, is completely ignored, in this professed condensation of Apostolical doctrine.

THE ATHENASIAN CREED, contains but one direct Christian truth, namely that Christ "suffered for our salvation;" but this is rendered ambiguous if not nullified by the unqualified statement respecting the judgment,—*"they that have done good shall go into life everlasting: and they that have done evil into everlasting fire."*

Undoubtedly this is a *scriptural* statement; so it is scriptural to declare that "every male shall be circumcised;" but this belongs to the law of Moses; and the former is but a partial statement, like our Lord's summary of the law, *"this do and thou shalt live."*

But since *none do good* absolutely, a creed or summary of doctrine, should take in all the elements of goodness, and shew them in their connection and dependence;—*how* a man may be just with God,—acceptable unto him. Whereas the Athenasian Creed is, *chiefly a compound of ecclesiastical metaphysics*, calculated to puzzle men's minds, but in no respect adapted to save their souls.

That Father, Son and Holy Ghost are one God, we hold most firmly; but that a man "must think of the trinity" as is laid down in that creed, or "without doubt perish everlastingly;" is certainly a great stretch of our faith, and a *great insult to the Scriptures*.

The Athenasian creed is an addition to the gospel, IT SHUTS THE DOOR OF MERCY TO ALL WHO DO NOT BELIEVE WHAT IS NOT IN THE SCRIPTURES.

The gospel is, that a man to be saved, must believe in Christ only; and the Athenasian Creed is, that a man shall not be saved, except he believe in Saint Athanasius.

"Quicumque vult.

"Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold

the Catholick faith. Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled : without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. And the Catholick faith is this : that we worship one God in trinity, and trinity in unity ; neither confounding the persons : nor dividing the substance. For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son : and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one : the glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son : and such is the Holy Ghost. The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate : and the Holy Ghost uncreate. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible : and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible. The Father eternal, the Son eternal : and the Holy Ghost eternal. And yet they are not three eternal : but one eternal. As also there are not three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated : but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty : and the Holy Ghost Almighty. And yet there are not three Almighties : but one Almighty. So the Father is God, the Son is God : and the Holy Ghost is God. And yet there are not three Gods : but one God. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord : and the Holy Ghost Lord. And yet not three Lords : but one Lord. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity, to acknowledge every person by himself to be God and Lord ; so are we forbidden by the Catholick religion, to say, there be three Gods, or three Lords. The Father is made of none : neither created, nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone : not made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son : neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding. So there is one Father, not three Fathers ; one Son, not three Sons ; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts. And in this trinity none is afore, or *after* other : none is greater, or less than another ; but the whole three persons are co-eternal together : and co-equal. So that in all things, as is aforesaid : the unity in trinity, and the trinity in unity is to be worshipped. He therefore that will be saved ; must thus think of the trinity. Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation : that he also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is, that we believe and confess : that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man : God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds : Man, of the substance of his mother, born in the world ; perfect God, and perfect Man : of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting ; equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead : and inferior to the Father, as touching his Manhood. Who although he God and Man : yet he is not two, but one Christ ; one ; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh : but by taking of the Manhood into God ; one altogether ; not by confusion of substance : but by unity of person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man : so God and Man is one Christ ; who suffered for our salvation : descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead. He ascended into heaven, he sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty : from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies : and shall give account of their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting : and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.

This is the Catholic faith: which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved. Glory be to the Father, &c. As it was in the beginning, &c."

Such a creed affords but poor spiritual fare; it is feeding men with chaff, or rather with stones, which will never be digested for the nourishment of spiritual life. The extremely metaphysical shape in which the truth is uncouthly disguised, rather than expressed, is unadapted to a religious end; whilst the aim at paradox, contradiction, or puzzle, as the exercise or test of hardihood of belief, is not likely to commend the truth to doubting minds; since this mocks and starves the intellectual as much as the religious element of our nature.

The Athenasian Creed is an admirable illustration of man's failure in originating, or rather even of expressing, by way of an inflexible and permanent standard—the principles of religion.

We are generally one-sided; we express only what is agreeable to our present intellectual view, in antagonism it may be, to some momentary and ephemeral heresy; and thenceforth our standards of faith, ever assume a *defensive attitude*, even when the enemy has retired; or has ceased to exist.

By this means the features of truth are distorted, it does not stand in the erectness and calmness of conscious majesty, to sway men by a magical sceptre, and banish errors by the brightness of its presence; but appears in the agonistic style, painfully striving for the mastery, and often, "as one that beateth the air;" not as the victor with invincible hands, whose might and prowess may have been partially put forth, but never in a doubtful strife; only and always to strike the decisive blow, and turn unfliningly the tide of victory.

Such should truth ever appear;—or, rather as a *judge*, not as a litigant, still less as counsel for either side; whereas many, perhaps all, human standards partake of the character of disputants, which is requisite and useful in its place; but is not the highest form of truth, nor suitable for its permanent and settled appearance in a "form of sound words."

It is one of the limitations of man, to mingle his own passions and weakness with his best works; to have the bias of his age in his art;—the school of society marring the lessons of nature; the colours of his regiment must mingle in the flag of his country: as pure art or patriotism, are thus circumscribed, by the limits of a school, an occasion, or a respect of persons; so the absolute truth, is often somewhat distorted by the immediate and occasional purpose of a controversial object: to answer which end, truth is expressed *so as to include in its statement the denial of something else*.

From this, we may deduce two general defects in the formally expressed creeds of human invention; first, that they are for the most part of a merely intellectual character; and secondly, not even purely intellectual truth, but distorted or disfigured as if frowning at some particular heresy, carrying the mark of an ephemeral disputation.

These defects are entirely avoided, in the divine method of conveying truth, by which the intellect is satisfied, and the affections also provided for; thus we have *not the ghost of a truth* in a theological definition, but

its spirit, and soul, and body, in the living portraiture of Jesus Christ, —not dissection and anatomy, but *perfect man*, as the standard by which we should attain to perfection.

This living embodiment of the truth in Jesus, is our freedom from all *obligation* to human creeds; which may be useful summaries of important doctrines, but are inadequate to the highest purposes of the Christian life.

(2) This important canon or rule of faith and life, bequeathed to us in the New Testament, as the true Apostles' Creed, not only emancipates us from slavish subjection to human creeds, teaching us that we may reject the metaphysics of Athenasius and others without "perishing everlastingly;" it also ANNULS THE DECREES OF COUNCILS, sets aside Pope's and fathers; and holds up Christ alone, as our standard of faith and duty.

The arguments of ecclesiastical history are nullified, its decisions repealed, by the *biography* of the Saviour given in the gospels, and the *character* of the Saviour drawn out in the epistles by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

A proper understanding of this Scriptural rule, cuts off all other standards and authorities: it seizes and condemns them as false weights and measures; they are nailed to the counter as base coin.

Perhaps few persons are prepared to abandon all that is so condemned; such as those who turn creeds into Shibboleths, or find *truth in a church*; the Romanist, for instance, declares that his *Church is infallible*, the priest preaches the Church, the Apostles preached Christ, and declared that the truth was in him.

The priest sums up the completeness and safety of a Christian, in his relation to the Pope, falsely styled the head of the Church, to whom fathers and councils are said to bear witness; but the Apostle condemns all such vain alliance; and places our safety in obedience to the true head of the Church, in *whom we are complete*—without the Papacy and its teachings; or any other traditions of men. For his converts he prayed—"that their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father and of Christ; in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. And this I say, lest any man should beguile you with enticing words. For though I be absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit, joying and beholding your order, and the steadfastness of your faith in Christ. As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so ye walk in him: rooted and built up in him, and established in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving. Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power."—Colos. ii. 2—10. "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God."—Colos. ii. 18, 19.

This Apostolical doctrine, of our completeness in Christ, as the only head mentioned and required, completely IGNORES THE POPE, and all the pretences of his Church, as set up in the infamous Creed of Pope Pius IV.

The following account of this Roman Creed, together with the document itself, will teach the reader how much necessity exists for the true Apostolical standard we are endeavouring to maintain.

"In December 1564, Pius IV. issued, as ordered by the Council [of Trent,] a short summary of the doctrinal decisions of the same, in the form of a Creed, which has ever since borne his name. It was immediately received by all the Romish Communion. It was enforced by a Bull, setting forth;—'That all those who henceforth should be set over Cathedrals, and the superior Churches, as to whom it should happen to superintend any of their dignities, canonries, or any other ecclesiastical benefices whatever, having care of souls, *are bound to promise and swear that they will make a public profession of the Orthodox faith*, and that they will *remain in the obedience of the Church of Rome*, as being willing that the same shall be observed also by all persons whatever belonging to monasteries, convents, religious houses, and all other places, of every order of regulars, even of the military orders.' . . . the aforesaid profession shall solemnly take place according to this and no other FORM in the following tenor:—

"I. N., believe and profess, with a firm faith, all and every one of the things which are contained in the symbol of faith which is used in the holy Roman Church," viz:—(Here is recited the Nicene Creed.)

"And then there is added, the following twelve new articles, now the Creed of the *Apostacy*, namely, that of POPE PIUS IV.

- I. "I most steadfastly admit and embrace the Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.
- II. I also admit the Sacred Scriptures, according to that sense which Holy Mother Church has held, and does hold, to whom it appertains to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.
- III. I also profess that there are, truly and properly, seven Sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one; to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, Eucharist, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, and that they confer grace; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege; and I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid Sacraments.
- IV. I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the Holy Council of Trent, concerning original sin and justification.
- V. I profess, likewise, that in the Mass there is offered unto God, a true proper and propitiary sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there are truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with

the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion, the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation.

- VI. I also confess, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true Sacrament.
- VII. I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.
- VIII. Likewise, that the saints, reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invoked; and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their Relics are to be venerated.
- IX. I most firmly assert that the Images of Christ, of the Mother of God, ever Virgin, and also of other saints, are to be had and retained; and that due honour and veneration are to be given to them.
- X. I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.
- XI. I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.
- XII. I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons and general Councils, and particularly by the Holy Council of Trent; and I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church has condemned, rejected, and anathematized."

"I, N. N., do at this present freely profess and sincerely hold this true Catholic faith, OUT OF WHICH NO MAN CAN BE SAVED; and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and inviolate, with God's assistance to the end of my life. And I will take care, as far as in me lies, that it shall be held, taught, and preached by my subjects, or by those, the care of whom shall appertain to me in my office; this I vow, promise, and swear,—so help me God and these Holy Gospels."

This creed is in every sense, a Pope's Creed, made by a Pope, to support by assertion the baseless assumptions of the Roman Church: it is wholly ecclesiastical and in no respect Christian; unlike the "Apostles' Creed," it does not even give historical Christian facts, but is composed of the lies of an arch-priest and his abettors. It is the most impious fraud and nefarious forgery ever perpetrated on mankind: and so we leave it, as a warning to men never to take the word of a priest in an affair of religion.

The statements of this creed are not truths in Jesus, and therefore are set aside by the standard provided in the New Testament. By this Apostolical rule, we are taught plainly, that **WHAT IS NOT IN CHRIST, NOR RELATED TO HIM, IS NO PART OF CHRISTIANITY**, nor any element of religion;—what we have not learned in Christ, is a delusion or imposture.

This infallible canon, not only sets aside creeds, councils, fathers,

Churches and priests, as having no authority; but demands the serious attention of another class, namely those who whilst not assuming authority, nor rejecting the gospel, yet do not receive the Saviour in the high character in which he is presented in the Scriptures. We omit the consideration of such as prefer the temple of nature to the temple of the Church; who profess to find and worship God in brooks, and trees, and fields, equally with, or in preference to, the gospel means of grace: who make the works of God a substitute for his word, which is to throw light on his works.

But we earnestly invite enquiring Unitarians to the consideration of this rule—"the truth is in Jesus," being convinced that such an estimate of Christianity would tend materially to influence their views as to the nature and position of the Redeemer.

It must be generally acknowledged and lamented by the thinking and serious amongst Unitarians themselves, that their system is devoid of moral power and spiritual life; at least to a very great degree defective in this respect: insomuch that many intelligent men, satisfied of the truth of Unitarianism, feel no peculiar obligation to join regularly in its public religious worship: and have more sympathy with the moral questions of philanthropy, than with anything peculiarly religious.

Perhaps the great reason why Unitarianism has never had much religious life in it, will be found in the fact *it is a system which divorces truth from the person of Christ*; it teaches not Christ, but certain moral doctrines in no way necessarily connected with the Saviour:—truths not as in Jesus; but as they could be preached without any mention of his name, or necessary regard for his person.

Morality, responsibility, a future life, without the dependence of these upon, or their relation to Christ, are truths *out of Jesus*, or apart from him, and therefore are not Christianity, which is the "truth in Jesus." On this point, we may advance two simple rules, to conclude our *deductions* from the New Testament Canon of life and doctrine; viz: (1st.) that as to understand Christ, is to know the whole of Christianity, so any truth, or pretended truth, not embodied in Christ, is no part of Christianity.

(2) Any truth in Christianity, when taken out and looked at alone, apart from Jesus, *is no longer part of that system*; it may be philosophy or heathenism, but loses the element of a *Christian* truth.

As for instance, the doctrine of a future state, is a Christian truth only as related to the Saviour—"I am the resurrection and the life."

The same principle is true, of practical duties,—as "do unto others as ye would they should do unto you,"—all forms of generosity, kindness, or justice, useful and binding in themselves, are Christian actions only when done out of regard to Christ.

Hence, to advocate duties apart from the right motive—"even as Christ also hath loved us," "let the same mind be in you"—is altogether wide of the mark. Giving a "cup of cold water," will be found no saving act, except as "*in the name of a disciple*,"—as recognizing and owning Christ in his little ones, the priest's curse is upon them, and it is dangerous to shew sympathy.

This rule is capable of extensive proof from the Scriptures:—"WHAT-

SOEVER YE DO *in word or deed*, DO ALL IN THE NAME OF THE LORD JESUS."—(Col. iii. 17.)—"and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not to men: . . . FOR YE SERVE THE LORD CHRIST."—(Col. iii. 23 24.)

As truly as believers must, like branches, abide in the true vine to bring forth good fruit, so every truth must be in Christ, and receive both its transforming or persuasive power, and its acceptableness in practice, from the same source: it will acquire its power as a sanctifying motive from its relation to the Saviour, and our obedience to this motive, will be accepted as "unto the Lord."

Whilst any doctrine regarded separately, as a truth divorced from Christ, is inoperative; it is AS A BRANCH THAT IS CUT OFF AND WITHERETH.

II.

PRIESTS' RELIGION.

HUMAN AUTHORITY AND INVENTION *versus* CONSCIENCE AND THE BIBLE.

The Scriptures are the only standard of Christian faith and practice: every one is at liberty to examine them; but no one is at liberty to decline this examination: and though we may receive the help of others, we may not rest on their authority, (which is man-worship;) nor receive as religion, what is not in the Scriptures, (which is will-worship.)

ROMAN ORATORY, AND PROTESTANT LOGIC.

THE Rev. Father Newman, late a member of the established clergy, and at present Father of the [Roman] Oratory, in Birmingham, is now delivering a course of Lectures on Catholicism in England, in the Corn Exchange, Birmingham.

It is quite a *study* to see him, as he comes and seats himself by the side of a swing desk, turns over in silence what appears to be the *proof sheets* of his Lecture; and then putting his finger first to his forehead, next to his chest, then to his left shoulder, and finally his right, should, by this devout crossing be prepared to address the Brothers of the Oratory.

His voice is somewhat womanly, his manner often very much like an excited and astonished gossip, as he twitches his gown; folds *his* hands on his knees, turns up the whites of his eyes, doing now the pathetic, and now the satirical, and now and then shuffling his chair about.

He is thin, spare, bloodless, perhaps "fasts twice a week," though no man should who can thank God for a good dinner,—by which both God and man are better served—he by thankfulness, we by his temporal bounty.

The presiding genius of this oratorical scene, is a picture of St. Philip, of Neri, the patron of the Oratorians. He is for all the world like Old Parr, the life-pill-man; that is, the pictures are alike, we cannot say anything as to their persons: nor will we make a comparison of their principles.

Poor Philip looks rather a fine old man, but seems rather crippled about the arms, as if he had lived an inactive life, or at least had been occupied chiefly in wool-gathering.

In his picture, he looks as if he had been used to sit in his arm chair,

and lean forward contemplatively upon his elbows, and had never done anything else: whereas the painter has taken the chair arms away, so the saint's arms hang in uncertainty; he does not like to put them down, and seems unable to hold them up, and we must leave him hanging at the back of the Oratorian, who, by the help of four candles on a swing desk, reads as follows, in very gentle tones:

"There is a well-known fable, of which it is to my purpose to remind you, my *Brothers of the Oratory*, by way of introducing to you the subject of the Lectures which I am proposing to deliver. I am going to inquire why it is, that, in this intelligent nation and in this rational nineteenth century, we Catholics are so despised and hated by our own countrymen, with whom we have lived all our lives, that they are prompt to believe any story, however extravagant, that is told to our disadvantage; as if beyond a doubt, we were, every one of us, either brutishly deluded or preternaturally hypocritical, and they themselves, on the contrary, were in comparison of us absolute specimens of sagacity, wisdom, uprightness, manly virtue, and enlightened Christianity. I am not enquiring why they are not Catholics themselves, but why they are so angry with those who are. Protestants differ amongst themselves, without calling each other fools and knaves. Nor, again, am I proposing to prove to you or to myself, that knaves and fools we are not, not idolaters, not blasphemers, not men of blood, not profligates, not steeped in sin and seared in conscience; for we know each other and ourselves. No, my Catholic friends, whom I am addressing, I am neither attacking another's belief just now, nor defending myself: I am not engaging in controversy, though controversy is good in its place; I do but propose to investigate how Catholics become to be so trodden under foot, and spurned by a people, which is endowed by nature with many great qualities, moral and intellectual; how it is that we are cried out against by the very stones, and bricks, and tiles, and chimney-pots of a populous busy place, such as this town which we inhabit. The clearer sense we have of our own honesty, of the singleness of our motives, and the purity of our aims,—of the truth, the beauty, the power, of our religion, its exhaustless fund of consolation for the weary, and its especial correspondence to the needs of the weak,—so much the greater may well be our perplexity to find that its advocates for the most part do not even gain a hearing in this country; that facts, and logic, and justice, and good sense, and right, and virtue, are all supposed to lie in the opposite scale; and that it is bid be thankful and contented, if it is allowed to exist, if it is barely tolerated, in a free people. Such a state of things is not only a trial to flesh and blood, but a discomfort to the reason and imagination: it is a riddle which frets the mind from the difficulty of solving it.

"Now then for my fable, which is not the worse because it is old. The Man once invited the Lion to be his guest, and received him with princely hospitality. The lion had the run of a magnificent palace, in which there were a vast many things to admire. There were large saloons and long corridors, richly furnished and decorated, and filled with a profusion of fine specimens of sculpture and painting, the works of the first masters in either art. The subjects represented were various; but the most prominent of them had an especial interest for the noble animal who

stalked by them. It was that of the lion himself; and as the owner of the mansion led him from one apartment into another, he did not fail to direct his attention to the indirect homage which these various groups and tableaux paid to the importance of the lion tribe.

"There was, however, one remarkable feature in all of them, to which the host, silent as he was from politeness, seemed not at all insensible;—that, diverse as were these representations, in one point they all agreed, that the man was always victorious, and the lion was always overcome. The man had it all his own way, and the lion was but a fool, and served to make him sport. There were exquisite works in marble, of Samson rending the lion like a kid, and young David taking the lion by the beard and choking him. There was the man who ran his arm down the lion's throat, and held him fast by the tongue; and there was that other who, when carried off in his teeth, contrived to pull a penknife from his pocket and lodge it in the monsters heart. Then there was a lion hunt, or what had been such, for the brute was rolling round in the agonies of death, and his conqueror on his bleeding horse was surveying them from a distance. There was a gladiator from the Roman amphitheatre in mortal struggle with his tawny foe, and it was plain who was getting the mastery. There was a lion in a net; a lion in a trap; four lions, yoked in harness, were drawing the car of a Roman emperor; and elsewhere stood Hercules, clad in the lion's skin, and with the club which demolished him.

"Nor was this all: the lion was not only triumphed over, mocked, spurned, but he was tortured into extravagant forms, as if he were not only the slave and creature, but the very creation of man. He became an artistic decoration, and an heraldic emblazonment. The feet of alabaster tables fell away into lions' paws; lions' faces grinned on each side the shining mantelpiece; and lions' mouths held tight the handles of the doors. There were sphinxes too, half lion, half woman; there were lions rampant holding flags, lions couchant, lions passant, lions regardant; lions and unicorns; there were lions white, black, and red: in short, there was no variety of misconception or excess of indignity which was thought to great for the lord of the forest and the king of brutes. After he had gone over the mansion, his entertainer asked him what he thought of the splendours it contained; and he in reply did full justice to the riches of its owner and the skill of its decorators, but he added, 'lions would have fared better, had lions been the artists.'

"You see the application, Brothers of the Oratory, before I make it; There are two sides to everything; there is a Catholic side of the argument, and there is a Protestant.

"Now I repeat, in order to obviate misconception, I am neither assuming nor intending to prove that the Catholic Church comes from above (though, of course, I should not have become one of her children, unless I firmly held her to be the direct work of the Almighty;) but here I am only investigating how it is she comes to be so despised and hated among us; since a religion need not incur scorn and animosity simply because it is not recognized as true. And, I say, the reason is this, that reasons of State, political and national, prevent her being heard in her defence. She is considered too absurd to be inquired into, and too corrupt to be defended, and too dangerous to be treated with equity and fair dealing.

She is the victim of a prejudice which perpetuates itself, and gives birth to what it feeds upon.

The Rev. Oratorian undertook to accomplish his task in twelve weekly Lectures, the seventh of which we heard last night (Aug. 18th.) His work is done so effectually that it is now contracted to nine Lectures: meanwhile a counter-course is commenced, respecting which we can say no more than give the title and extracts from the first Lecture, they are published at a cheap rate, two pence each, four are promised, two have been delivered, and the whole four will be printed before this article meets the eye of the reader.

They are entitled "Orations to the Oratorians; being a supplement to the Rev. Dr. Newman's Lectures on 'Catholicism in England,' by the Rev. Brewin Grant, B.A. By Lawful Authority. London: Ward & Co.

"We cannot more appropriately commence this course of Lectures, than in the words of the Apostle Paul: 'I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.'—(Rom. i. 16.) *The gospel* is a divine provision, of itself accompanied with such power; not by the retinue of priests; not receiving its authority or validity from Rome; but emanating as to its locality from the old Jerusalem, to rule by its declarations the New Jerusalem—the Church of the living God; without regard to geographical boundaries or any place where Satan's seat is, and is changed into Peter's: for neither in this mountain of Rome, Jerusalem, nor Samaria, shall men exclusively reverence the Father, since 'the hour *now is*' when 'men shall worship him in spirit and in truth,' not in priestcraft and *pontificalibus*. It is in order to renounce and disprove the pretences of Rome to any headship over the Church, or to the respect and obedience of Christendom, and to expose those pretences as put forth by the Oratorian, the Rev. Father Newman, that we enter the lists of controversy on this occasion. That we can thus debate without fear, we have to thank God, and not the Pope; not those priests who so thoroughly indoctrinated the world with persecuting principles as to make it difficult even for the Reformers themselves (whilst abandoning many other errors of Rome) to become free from a principle which had been branded into their flesh, and deeply impressed on their souls, by the practices and teachings of Rome.

"In undertaking this cause (which we do with a sincere desire of enlightening Roman Catholics as well as of strengthening Protestants against all unfair artifices and cloistered sophistry,) we have no other rule than the truth of God as mercifully revealed in the gospel of his Son,—those words which will judge both Catholic and Protestant at the last day. And surely that which will be our law then, should be our law now.

"If in this controversy we utter expressions and refer to questions that in other circumstances should be avoided, let this be set down to the occasion which has called us forth—to repudiate once again the bold and shameless pretences of an unscriptural fraternity of priests, falsely calling themselves God's Church; and as falsely putting that Church in the position of a Lord, or rather Lady over men instead of a servant of God.

"There are two points worthy of notice in entering upon this refutation of Dr. Newman:—

"First, that he professedly avoids the question whether Romanism or Protestantism be true; yet assumes the truth of Romanism, and declares Protestantism to be based on falsehood, as if this were really the question he had discussed, instead of the one he had in words abandoned. There is in this an artifice worthy of his cause.

"And secondly, the Rev. Father professedly lectures 'to the Brothers of the Oratory,' addresses them throughout, whilst he has brought them from home where he might have told them his whole mind, and talks to them before a Birmingham public, who are by placards invited to the scene, but shut out from a formal answer, since he is speaking only to the household of Philip, his patron saint.

"Nevertheless, these Lectures are printed. and are to be published as an appeal to the world, under the cloak of a word to the Oratoriana. There is no reason for this sideling method, except from the fact that priests, being so accustomed to indirect means, are scarcely able to do anything straightforwardly even when they might do it without any one complaining of the course they adopt.

"If Dr. Newman intended to address the public, why not do so like a man, and as one who has no more reason to be afraid than he has to be ashamed? If he meant only the Brothers of the Oratory, why not give them a course of private lectures in their own snugery, amidst 'certain rows of empty blacking bottles, legs of mutton, and pats of butter,' which are still safe from Protestant violence?

"The Rev. Father professes to discuss one point, he concludes about another: he pretends to talk to one class of men, and all the while means somebody else: 'Brothers of the Oratory'—this is oratorical.

"Personally we have nothing to say respecting the worthy Father, premising only, that he is learned and eloquent; but was equally learned and quite as eloquent whilst for years a clergyman in the Church of England; and therefore it may be a mystery how this new light got into his mind; and whether, as he gets more advanced, he may not be visited with some further revelations, is still a matter of doubt, so that his only claim to speak the infallible truth is—that he is a fallible man.

"That the Rev. Oratorian, professedly avoids the question of the truth of Romanism is plain, from many declarations, as,—'my Catholic friends, whom I am addressing, I am neither attacking another's belief just now, nor defending myself; *I am not engaging in controversy.*'—(Lect. I. p. 2.) And again, 'however without going on to the question where the truth lies, which is a further question, and not to my present purpose, &c.'—(Page 5.) And again, (page 11) 'now I repeat, in order to obviate misconception, that I am *neither assuming nor intending to prove* that the Roman Catholic Church comes from above, &c.'

"Yet what is the Doctor's conclusion, after refuting some Maria Monk, whom he describes as a crazy moll? It is this vast leap,—that 'to Protestantism, false witness is the principle of propagation.'—(Page 122.) And again, that 'truth is not equal to the exigences of the Protestant cause; falsehood is its best friend.'—(Lect. IV. p. 166.)

"Yet he was not enquiring where truth lay; he repudiated at the start, all investigation as to the truth of either side, so that his arguments might not be attacked on the merits of the question, and then having argued for one thing, he concludes for what he refused to enter upon.

"Brothers of the Oratory, if you mean to refute Protestantism, refute the Bible, or at least argue from it; but lest we should put in this plea, your orator says he is not enquiring after the truth, so he refutes Maria Monk, and then says that falsehood is the best friend of Protestantism, as if Protestantism rested on that lady.

"And lest we should charge this method with unfairness, it is generously admitted that we have some arguments and authors worthy of notice,—but these are not to the present point, since he is not enquiring into the real question, therefore he pursues this crazy young woman, *and leaves all our MEN*, that he may triumph over Protestantism!—which he beforehand declared *not to be the point*. The whole proceeding is consistent—the Father talks to the Brothers, and means the heretics; *he refuses to TRY Protestantism, but concludes by HANGING it*. This is a pleasant logical *auto da fe*. In addition to these favourite exhibitions of the 'double shuffle,' in the Lectures, and their fervid appeals to the brethren, the reason for giving the Lectures, the professed purpose—to shew why Catholics are hated and abused—is altogether a false pretence, for Catholics are no more hated and abused by Protestants than Protestants by Catholics. So then in his indirect means to undermine the truth, he commences with the assumption of a falsehood.

"But there is another question not entered into in the first five Lectures—*why do the Protestants in general turn away with dislike from the PRINCIPLES AND DOCTRINES OF ROME?*

"It is because those principles avowedly set aside man's right to judge for himself, and because those doctrines are a burlesque on the glorious gospel of the blessed God.

"It is from a knowledge of Rome and of the Bible, that Protestants have a deep, lasting, and indelible abhorrence of the practices, teachings, and pretensions of Rome.

"And this abhorrence we are prepared to justify in controversy with any recognized representative of Rome, in fair encounter, by the pen or by oral discussion.

"It is from a disordered imagination that our Oratorian seeks to explain 'how it is they are cried out against by the very stones, and bricks, and tiles, and chimney-pots of a populous busy place such as this town which they inhabit.'

"The chimney-pots are very innocent and very quiet: except in a squall, 'they never say nothing to nobody,' though, if *a priest think, from his peculiar dress and lofty pretensions*, that the very chimney-pots and tiles are laughing at him, he must not transfer his indignation to a peaceable community.

"And since all these inanimate things are really so quiet at present, we could not but say a few words, lest if '*we* hold our peace the stones *should* cry out.'

"The penitent priest adopts, in his extremity, Protestant diet, prescribed as follows:—

"'No conclusion is trustworthy which has not been tried by enemy as well as friend; no traditions have a claim upon us which shrink from criticism, and dare not look a rival in the face. Now this is precisely the weak point of Protestantism in this country. It is jealous of being questioned; it resents argument; it flies to State pro-

tection; it forbids competition. How can you detect the sham, but by comparing it with the true? So is it in religion. Protestantism is at best but a fine piece of wax-work, which does not look dead, only because it is not confronted by that Church which really breathes and lives. The living Church is the test and the confutation of all false Churches; therefore get rid of her at all hazards; tread her down, gag her, dress her like a felon, starve her, bruise her features, if you would keep up your mumbo-jumbo in its place of pride. By no means give her fair play; you dare not.

"Dare you? do you, in any country, where you have the power to prevent it? Is this 'precisely the weak point of Protestantism in this country?' and is not your *strong point* HERE, and your weak point amongst the *Catholic powers*?"

After illustrations from the present position of Tuscany, Austria, Naples, &c., the Protestant Oratorian proceeds:—

"Thus have we exposed, by modern instances, the shameless hypocrisy of our Oratorian.

"Brothers of the Oratory, who taught Protestantism to fly to the State for protection? what did the State protect before it repudiated Rome? It was your own superlative 'mumbo-jumbo,' which you would, doubtless, like to set up again.

"This is *your fair play*, to accuse us of your sins; to say Protestantism is lame because it, in some forms, uses your old crutches. Know, then, that in America it walks without them, and that in England it is not these crutches, but the living element of religion which supports Protestantism, in spite of, and not by the help of, those encumbering locomotives. It carries your crutches under its arm; they are in its way when it walks through the crowd; they may be returned to the State some day, and then Protestantism will renew its youth like the eagle, but the crutches will not be once more handed over to you, they will go with the woods and forests and make a national bonfire.

"But, brethren, as to this 'mumbo-jumbo,' what can you say against it, except—what the majority of the laity, and all Dissenters, and some clergy feel—that it is, in some things, *too much like its predecessor*? So that there is no hope for your calves of Dan and Bethel. The English Church is a step in the right direction—from the Pope to the State; the next will be to carry out the Royal Supremacy as the harbour of freedom and equity for all men's consciences, a sanctuary against the forcible intrusion of usurping priests. All you say against the Elizabethan style will not improve your own; it may help to reform the reformation, to which all true hearts are tending, both inside and outside, of the Establishment.

"Puseyism will only prove to Churchmen that some seed of Rome are left, which grow into tares, and are only spared till now, from a fear lest in removing the tares we root up the wheat also. The lesson is beginning to be learnt, that the parable has been misapplied.

"And you, Brethren of the Oratory, how do you support your 'mumbo-jumbo'? Have you a sacred horror of the State's support. Is not yours a mumbo-jumble of State and Church together? Does his Holiness of Rome,—

'Melchisedek, that wondrous priest,
That man of high degree,'—

keep erect on his tripod without State props: Did he not return like a

sheep to his fold—like one only by wearing a sheepskin—and feed his tender lambs with good round cannon balls? Did not your ‘mumbo’ totter and fall, east, west, north, and south, till he was propped up by the bayonets of recreant France?

“Brothers of the Oratory, do you ever do penance by blushing, or will you only laugh up your sleeve, and forget the privilege of modesty, in your cells of celibacy? ‘It resists argument, it flies to the State for protection:’ *what* does? Ask his Holiness, who is afraid even to trust his own State; who first bombarded, and secondly garrisoned Rome, and thirdly looks imploringly to Austria to be ready against the chances of the next French election, in order that, by his gunpowder gospel, he may repress for a time, the inevitable shout of Mazzini, Gavazzi, and emancipated Italy!”

Mr. Grant’s first Lecture concludes as follows:—“WE UNDERTAKE TO PROVE, AGAINST POPE, CARDINAL, BISHOP, OR PRIEST, IN EQUAL DISCUSSION, either by mutual pamphlets, *in which the disputants shall print in parallel columns, meeting paragraph by paragraph*,—or by separate pamphlets,—or by oral discussion, the following points:—

1. “That the Apostle Peter had no supremacy over the other Apostles.
2. “That the Pope is not the Successor of Peter, nor Vicar of Christ, nor Head of Christendom, but a Usurper.
3. “That the Roman Catholic Church is a fiction, and not well defined.
4. “That the Roman Catholic Church, as an Association of Priests, in the assumed capacity of teacher, cannot interpret the Scriptures, and the doctrine of Infallibility is itself unsettled, and one instance of incompetence.
5. “That the peculiar Roman doctrines of Confession, Penance, Purgatory, Mass, Intercession of Saints, Celibacy, Transubstantiation, and the Sacrament in one kind—Opus operatum, or sacramental efficacy (including the succession of the priesthood)—are notorious instances of inability to understand, or unwillingness to teach, the doctrines of Christianity.
6. “Finally, that the assumption of authority in the so-called Catholic Church, (1) is a stigma on the Divine Revelation; (2) Usurpation against the Head of the Church; (3) the source of wars and murders; (4) an insult to the common sense of mankind.”

III.

STATESMEN'S RELIGION.

"EVERY PLANT WHICH MY HEAVENLY FATHER HATH NOT PLANTED, SHALL BE ROOTED UP."—(Matt. xv. 13.)

In those who think a National Church right, Dissent is a sin ; in those who think it wrong, silence is a shame.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF AN ATHEIST.*

(Continued from page 381.)

IN opposition to our Atheist's *ideal* liberty or Queen of Genius and Progress, we have invoked a *real* person ; the true author of human freedom. This King of Progress and great Emancipator, is even more glorious than Mr. Holyoake's *ideal* liberty, for those who fall in *her* cause *have no hope*, according to our Author ; but "*they who lose their lives for my sake*," saith the Redeemer, "*the same shall find it*," through all eternity.

The Atheist has no such cheering hope ; and whilst Mr. Holyoake bows to liberty, walking over the grave of his child, that liberty promises him no hereafter and no resurrection.

"Yes," proceeds our Author, "though I neither hope—for that would be presumptuous—nor expect it, seeing no foundation, I shall be pleased to find a life after this. Not a life where those are punished who were unable to believe without evidence, and unwilling to act in spite of reason—for the prospect of annihilation is pleasanter and more profitable to contemplate : not a life where an easy faith is regarded as 'easy virtue' is regarded among some men—but a life where those we have loved and lost here, are restored to us again—for there, in that Hall where those may meet who have been sacrificed in the cause of duty—where no gross, or blind, or selfish, or cruel nature mingles, where none sit but those whom human service and endurance have purified and entitled to that high company, Madeline will be a Hebe. Yes, a future life, bringing with it the admission to such companionship, would be a noble joy to contemplate. But Christianity has no such dream as this.

Christianity has no such *dream*, but it has the REALITY, which is better than a dream ; and even a dream is better than nothing ; except it be the dream of annihilation or punishment, the only alternative for those who deny or defy the Creator and judge.

* The History of the Last Trial by Jury for Atheism. A Fragment of Autobiography. By George Jacob Holyoake.

Christianity requires not to believe against evidence, but judges men by their advantages; and its faith is no easy virtue, but an element of enduring sanctifying principle. "The pure in heart shall see God;" into whose presence, "nothing shall enter that defileth or maketh a lie."

Christianity offers pardon, but demands holiness as a pledge of gratitude, and proof of faith. It opens heaven to such as are "new creatures in Christ Jesus," created after the image of God, "in righteousness and true holiness." And therefore the heaven of "easy virtue," which Mr. Holyoake repudiates, is not the heaven of Christianity. "Shall we continue in sin, that Grace may abound? God forbid!" "His servants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness—for the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."—(Eph. iv. 24. Rom. vi. 12, 16, 23) "For God hath not called us to uncleanness, but to holiness."—(1 Thess. iv. 7.)

Why should men pervert the gospel, and thus increase their enmity and rob themselves of its blessings? Would the Atheist then really delight in the hopes of "glory, honour, immortality, eternal life?" They are open to him and to all, through Jesus Christ, who whilst securing our pardon for all sins, secures our holiness by the motives, helps, and prospects thus freely offered to the chief of sinners. Would Mr. Holyoake really rejoin his departed child? that also is provided for: "suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven:" "so it is not the will of your heavenly Father that one of these little ones should perish:" "for their angels (*i. e.* their departed spirits) do always behold the face of my Father, who is in heaven."—Matt. xix. 14. Matt. xviii. 10, 14.)

"But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, *that ye sorrow not even as others who have no hope*; for if we believe that JESUS DIED AND ROSE AGAIN, *even so them also which sleep in Jesus, will God bring with him.*"—(1 Thess. iv. 13, 14.) That is, those who die in the hopes of the gospel, depart to be with Christ, and will at last come with Christ to be re-clothed in a glorious body,—to resume that part of their nature which by death sleeps in the dust.

And hence Paul exhorts all Christians to look for the Saviour's glorious appearing, to expect a crown of life; and in the hope of this, Stephen bowed himself a martyr to liberty and truth, yet died in triumph, saying, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit."—(Acts vii. 59.)

Yes, and that very Saul, who urged on the murderers of Stephen, and took care of their clothes, "consenting to his death;" who breathed out threatenings and slaughter against the followers of Jesus, was afterwards received and pardoned: and holds up his own case, as a pattern of hope to all who may, like him, have been strenuous opponents of the gospel of Christ.

THUS, AND NOT WITH GAOLS, does the Redeemer invite men into his service; and we quote the example of Paul, in the fervent hope that those who may have been led by false exhibitions of the gospel into the ranks of its enemies, may be won and encouraged to accept the hopes and enter into the duties of the gospel.

"And I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that

he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry; who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief. And the grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant with faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am the chief. Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first, Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting. Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen."

In these hopes, there would be found the true stoical heroism, to endure all evils and persecutions: "this is your victory which overcometh the world, even your faith" in a better world. With such hopes, the Christian martyr has *no need to provide that dreadful resource* which was Mr. Holyoake's last resort and defence—should evils come too thick for endurance—during his imprisonment.

"Mathematical studies were impossible, for the authorities also refused to allow me my instruments, lest I should commit suicide with them; but I had provided for that, as every man should who goes to gaol. There was just width enough in my cell to admit of the heavy iron bed-frame being raised on one end. By marking a circle round one of the legs, which I did with a fragment of stone, I determined the place on which the leg would fall when the frame was pulled down. My head once placed on that spot, the great weight of the frame would have sent the narrow leg through the brain, and death must have been instantaneous. I am no friend of suicide, and had a thousand reasons for living; but I had not been long in gaol before I saw many things to which none but the degraded or the weak would submit—and lest they should come to my turn, I *provided* against them."

This is a melancholy and fearful revelation, frankly made in our Author's history of his trial and imprisonment; and it is thus alone that his present principles can *provide* against possible evils! A sad and miserable *provision* indeed,—"*if in this life only we have hope, we are of all men most miserable*;"—"*if our best hope is to extinguish our present life, on the pitiable risk of a "probability."*"

Well, if it be probable there is no God, it is also probable there is one; to die in the hopes of God and eternity, *may be* a delusion, but to die without them *must be* presumption: one is safe, the other is truly a leap in the dark, which none but blind men should venture.

Looking at the advantage of Atheistic principles, by the light of Mr. Holyoake's final resource, we cannot but feel the truth of his own account of the opinions of others,—*which from experience ought to be his own opinion* :—

"Learned divines, and sage writers on Atheism, agree that it is too absurd to need refutation—too barren to satisfy, too monstrous to attract, too fearful to allure, too dumb to speak, and too deathly not to appal its own votaries. It is styled too grave to entertain youth, and too devoid of consolation for the trembling wants of age—too abstract for the com-

* *Chaplain*.—"Then where would you leave the question of Atheism?"

Holyoake.—"Just where it leaves us both. *It is a question of probability.*"

prehension of the ignorant, and too unreasonable to gain the admiration of the intelligent. That it is alarming to the timid, and disquieting to the brave—that it negatives everything, and sets up nothing, and is so purely speculative that it can never have a practical bearing on the business of life.”

May not Mr. Holyoake himself be cited to give in evidence of the truth of these judgments respecting Atheism? Does it not eat out the flower of manhood, making the brave cowardly shrink into the grave from the stern battle of duty and endurance? *Did the Apostle Paul, or John Bunyan, or any religious man persecuted for conscience sake, ever entertain the purpose of this PROVISION against temporal evils?*

What consolation in sorrow, what help to principle, what check to sin, what restraint in power, what support in weakness, what hope in death, is afforded by the doctrine that there is no God?

If the only refuge is such as our friend was driven to think of, if he can recommend no better to “every man who goes to gaol,” then we fear it must be pronounced to be a truly *barren* philosophy, since when the worst comes to the worst, any man may put an end to his life, though he may afterwards be astonished to find that he has not *put an end to himself*. Any poor fool can cut his throat, or drown himself; here the simpleton equals the philosopher. The insane, the depraved, the most pitiable wretch, the most abandoned miscreant, *can find death's door without the black candle of an Atheistical philosophy*; but that a man of so many refined sensibilities, touched with the generous affections of our nature, blessed with a quick and not uncultivated understanding; who exclaimed in disgust—“must I be classed with thieves and felons,” who refused to be handcuffed to one such;—that a person of this character should yet voluntarily hand-cuff himself to a hardened and insane gang of suicides, is equally wonderful and lamentable.

We write not this in reproach, but purely in sorrow and sympathy, earnestly desiring that such men, laying aside all illgotten prejudices, forgetting what pretended Christians have inflicted, and fairly considering what true Christianity is, would compare the dark prospect afforded by their philosophy, with the eternal life freely offered in the glorious gospel of the blessed God.

N.B. We intend in our next, to examine *some of the sentiments and reflections* contained in the Autobiography, the historical parts of which have been already noticed.

IV.

SCEPTICS' RELIGION.

Under this department, sceptical objections, and systems or principles advocated as hostile to Christianity, are dispassionately considered.

PASSAGES IN THE LIFE OF AN ENQUIRER.

(Continued from page 326.)

CHAP. V.

PERPLEXITIES OF AUTHORS—STORY OF LOUISE.

Otho.—She hath a heart whose kindling sympathies
 Are great enough to girdle all the world,
 And ye have pent them in the petty round
 Of a nun's rosary. Her searching eyes
 Looked up for God, and could but see your saints—
 The crowding mists ye raise to thwart the sun.
 Your rites of his o'ergrow deserted Truth,
 As ivy fallen towers, and falsehood only,
 That hides and eats into what truth it clasps,
 Is sleek and green among ye. God himself
 Must only talk with creatures he hath made
 Through your monastic grating.—*False Priest and fair Lady.*

EXTRAORDINARY are the experiences and most peculiar the perplexities of an author with more on his hands than he knows how to get rid of—who enjoys the happiness of meeting his readers, like friends after being separated, with so much to say, that he is in danger of saying nothing. The cause of such temporary paucity of speech among those who so meet will be explained to you by any metaphysician,—(i. e. a man supposed to possess an internal companion-ladder, whereby he goes down stairs into the depths of his own mind, and shouts out to the people above, about what is in the hold or between decks)—will be explained, we say (there is a pleasure in writing a long sentence in this age of short sentences, of phrases puffing and short winded, who come up in an excited state, lay down a nominative, adjective, and it may be an auxiliary verb, and then surprise all present by coming to a full stop, and expiring on the spot,)—will be explained, we repeat (again interrupted by the turbulence of a parenthesis, who seems to forget that one idea is in the chair, and should be heard and obeyed before any other) explained—we triumphantly exclaim, at last, by the supposition that the ideas of various ranks and conditions of life in the mind are all crowding so to the gate of speech that they trample each other down in the passage, and so block it up that not one can extricate itself, come forth in utterance, and be transformed, from a

winged thought, into a winged word. The aim of writing is to impress persons with the ideas we wish to convey. Now it is one thing to *say* we have such or such ideas to communicate, another actually to impart them. Now, we ask, would any reiteration of the fact that we had so much to say that we knew not what to say first, have enabled you to realize the truth so effectually as the elephantine and unwieldy sentence you had to read just now? In reading it, some of the very confusion in our own mind must have been also experienced in yours. This is admitted by all to be the height of art,—the power of transfusing, with scarcely any loss or alteration, your own impressions to the mind of another.

We wish to tell you about Pastor Ahlfeld, about Rogers thoughts on religious questions, about Louise, about Doctor Heinrichs, who, though styled neither Doctor *ecstaticus*, like Ruysbrock; nor Doctor *resolutissimus*, like Durandus de S. Parciano; nor Doctor *singularis*, like Occam; nor Doctor *Angelicus*, like Thomas Aquinas; nor Doctor *subtilis*, like Dans Scotus; was yet a Doctor worth knowing.

What are we doing? Looking about on the chimney-piece for a halfpenny. That shall decide between the rival claimants. As each subject loses, it is thrown out, till we are reduced to two:—Louise and Doctor Heinrichs. Which will have it? The Doctor has lost. You shall have the story of Louise.

It will be needful to retrace our steps. Nearly two years before the period at which the story has now arrived, Roger was in Königsberg. He was on his way home one day, about noon; returning from superintending some workmen, to his frugal dinner in a room very near the roof—when the clouds which had been brewing mischief all the sultry morning came down with their storm.—Vollies of rain battered the stones and roofs, and raked and tore the softened soil, creating innumerable brown torrents, that leaped and bubbled, as though they had a source beneath the muddy earth, and had been made to spring up at a stroke. The lightning darted its fire-talons, now at this object, now at that,—and then the thunder crashed and reverberated with a long rattle of explosions. The sound was as if the clouds had been shields of iron which an army of giants held over their heads (after the fashion of the Roman *testudo*,) as they advanced to the siege of some Olympian fortress high in air,—as though, on these, mighty hands from above had hurled masses of rock, which leaped as lightly as pebbles along a roof, from shield to shield, with awful clangour at each rebound, along all the vast array beneath, and sank in the earth, at last, far away beyond the hidden hills; or plunged into the vexed sea, dim and misty with the driving rain.

Roger, turning a corner, found himself at the entrance of a long street, already deserted, and terminated by the walls of a convent. He ran on, but, as frequently happens in such cases, no protection could he find. The perpetual line of inhospitable wall, over which no roof lapped far enough for shelter, and in which not a window or recess had been made, seemed as if it would never cease to mock him. At last he discerned a narrow passage, partially roofed over, and into this he hurried. Thus sheltered, he stood and waited a weary time for the lessening of the storm. The passage-way was dark, and he stood at the end nearest the street, watching what little there was to see. For some time he observed

the clouds, here ragged and torn by the weight of water which had broken through their swathing; there the frayed films branching out, as in search of each other, and presently knitting together, and uniting in a new form. He looked long on a hideous gargoyle at the corner of the roof—one of the figures placed at such angles in the old gothic edifices, as ornamental spouts—through whose mouth the collected rain was leaping in a jet into the street. It was a quaint figure, half demon, half dragon, with its fore-legs a-kimbo, the claws pressed to either side of the scaly belly, and the over-hanging face expressive of anguish and malignity together. Roger fancied it looked at him with an aspect of ill-favoured jeering, as though every splash or dropping he received from time to time, was a delight to it, and the loathly creature were trying hard to wriggle itself round, and discharge its torrent in his face. Roger smiled inwardly, and said to himself,—“I’ll turn thee to purpose, too,”—so, taking out his pocket-book, he began to make a drawing of it. “It will be the very thing,” thought he, “as a design for the silver dagger-hilt I have to make for the Russian count; he wanted something original and appropriate, and he never saw a hilt with such a head as this will make.”

While he was thus engaged, in the true artist-spirit, turning everything to account, he thought he heard a faint groan, and looking round to the extremity of the passage, perceived what appeared in the obscurity a figure, in the habit of a nun, lying on the step.

He approached, and enquired in a tone as assuring as he could, while in phraseology as respectful and polite as his then recent acquaintance with the language placed at his command, if he could render any assistance.

A voice scarcely audible from weeping, replied, “They have shut the door.”

Roger looked more closely at the figure, as she rose to allow him to advance, and try whether his strength could open the massive door, studded with nails, which might almost from its own weight, have afforded an insurmountable barrier to one so weak as she was. He judged her about sixteen years old, and discerned now, that though dressed in black, she had not the attire of those who have taken the veil. Thoroughly wet with the rain, in the utmost terror and distress to find her return cut off,—her looks, her entreaties to him to attempt to open it; her sobs, the shiver that passed repeatedly through her frame, whether from the chill of fever already assailing her delicate nature, or from the violence of the apprehension she suffered,—all combined to touch the heart of Roger with compassion. Indeed, it did not require beauty so rare as hers, or circumstances so unwonted as these, to urge him to assist a fellow-creature in trouble. But all the strength of his powerful limbs was put forth in vain. Now and then the thunder would drown the noise of the most violent of his persevering efforts, just after a sudden flash in the loud-falling rain, had lit for an instant the anxious face of the maiden, as she stood watching with breathless expectation, and the straining form of the youth, as he wrestled with the obstacle. It was soon too obvious that the door had not been merely blown to and latched by the gate, but secured in some way within.

Roger, mortified and exhausted, cast on the maiden a sorrowful look, which plainly said, there is no hope. She glanced timidly at him, too much in fear of her auxiliary to express her thanks; and then the consciousness of her position overwhelmed her still more with new alarm. Her absence, now inevitably discovered, disgrace and contempt in the little world which had been long all the world to her,—at the mercy, henceforth, of all those petty persecutions, which, in seclusion, become giant and agonizing wrongs—perhaps imprisonment or hopeless surveillance, at least,—all these things were present at once to her distress, and her tears, for some moments, were those of complete despair. But she felt she could sooner die where she stood, than re-enter the convent, to endure its suffering, multiplied seven-fold. Her resolution was taken—anywhere into the wide world, but not there again after this.

“Shall I conduct you round to the great gate?” asked Roger.

“No, no. Never.”

“Will you come with me to the house of my friend?—a man advanced in years, grey-haired, and kindly, whose wife will treat you as her daughter. You shall have warmth and rest; and you must have them ere long, or you will die. You are very ill.”

But no. She shrank from him in alarm.

“The friend I speak of is named Heinrichs, Doctor Heinrichs, the professor: surely you have heard of him.”

She remembered to have heard him much spoken against in the convent. This was in favour of Roger’s proposal, since such a man would be less likely, she thought, than another, to give her up on the demand of the spiritual authorities. The fact, also, that Roger himself was evidently a foreigner, spoke on his behalf. He was less likely as a comparative stranger, to have any ill-design in such a proposal.

“How long have you been in Königsberg?” she enquired.

“Three days.”

There was a long pause. She seemed to forget the illness which had seized her, in her determination to abstract herself for this decision. At length, after remaining what seemed to the impatience of Roger an age, with her eyes fixed on the ground, balancing in thought the probabilities of consequence, did she accept, or did she reject, the offer, she said, “I will go with you.”

Roger overjoyed, assumed, not without trepidation, the office of support and of conductor. He did not attempt to enter into conversation; she looked too ill; and the word or two he did speak, seemed unheard. When they reached the market-place, her limbs could scarcely sustain her longer; and she was committed, almost unconscious, to the care of the excellent Fran Doctoria.

Such was the first meeting of Roger and Louise.

Roger had felt the neighbourhood of the mere stones of the convent anything but exhilarating—those long grey walls—the inscrutable dullness—the whole aspect of the building, so frigid, so monotonous; so selfishly incurious in its appearance, of the outer world,—without any eye or outlet to look at that,—but with a frown to repulse all who would enquire into the history of its own world within. Edifices have their expression as well as facts; and the expression of this one was not in-

ving. Let us ascertain how far the inward character answered to this unprepossessing exterior.

The convent of St. Joseph, under the superintendence of Mère D'Avila, had long enjoyed high repute among the Roman Catholics of the north. The discipline of the nuns there was less severe than that of the Feuillantes, who practised, it is said, penances so barbarous, that fourteen of them died in one week, and the Pope was obliged to write them a letter requesting more moderation. On the other side, it was less lax (and less useful, accordingly,) than the institutions of the Ursulines, who devoted themselves to instruction, of the Visitandines, who nursed the sick. It had been the ambition of Mère D'Avila to become a second St. Teresa, a great conventional reformer. A spaniard by birth, she idolized that fanatical revivalist of the Spanish Carmelites. She lived for one object—to make her convent as close a resemblance as possible of the pattern recorded in the writings of St. Teresa.

To the care of Mère D'Avila the orphan Louise had been committed when an infant. Ignorant of her family name or descent, without any one to enquire after her, she became, as it were, the child of the convent. The rigid features of many an aged nun, seared by long years of *enfermi*, and the little jealousies so active in a mind uninformed and unoccupied, relaxed into a heathen smile at the prattle of the little Louise. But as she grew up the scene changed.

At St. Joseph's, happy were they who could see visions and dream dreams. Mère D'Avila had herself enjoyed several strong and indisputable raptures, and her dreams were frequent and wonderful, all of them written down in a large book after the manner of St. Teresa. Those sisters who were kind-hearted and sensible, but practical in their temperament, were assigned a most subordinate, almost a degraded position, in the esteem of the prioress; and such indulgence as she could show, was exclusively reserved for the more weak and enthusiastic among the nuns, who possessed the same passion for ecstasies, visions, and special revelations, as herself. Now Louise did not possess the character so much in request at the convent. Her imagination was powerful; and had it been unbalanced by other faculties, would have given to her devotion that dreamy, somnambulist, and half-crazed complexion, which was the sure road to preferment. But she had also much natural good sense, which her narrow education could not supplant, a fair share of independence of spirit and determination, and, most of all, a disposition eminently benevolent. An impression, which she could not shake off, that all this devotion was grievously defective, as leading to no practical blessing for mankind, gave her a distaste for the religious exercises in vogue. While all the rest were trying more or less to experience extraordinary sensations, straining after the gift of tears, gazing for a long time at a single object till they grew dizzy, and thought they saw shapes in the air,—Louise declared she had never heard or seen anything remarkable while at her devotions. She was much pitied at first, and then despised and disliked, as one suffering a judicial privation of the grace of God. In vain did Mère D'Avila direct her to read over and over again St. Teresa's *Castillo interior*, and *Libros de Perfeccion*, translated into German,—the Life of the Saint,—St. Francois de Sales, *Introduction a la Vie*

Devote, especially chap. XIV., of the fourth part, *Des Secheresses et sterilités spirituelles*, Maria de Agreda's *Mystica Ciudad de Dios*, &c. The following vision, related in the life of Teresa, produced a very opposite effect to that which the prioress desired:—"I saw an angel very near me, towards my left side, in a corporeal form, (which is not usual with me; for though angels are often represented to me, it is only by the intellectual vision.) This angel appeared rather little than big, and very beautiful; his face was so inflamed, that he seemed to be one of those highest angels called seraphims, who seem to be all on fire with divine love. He had in his hand a long golden dart, and at the end of the point methought there was a little fire; and I conceived that he thrust it several times through my heart after such a manner, that it passed through my very bowels; and when he drew it out, methought it pulled them out with it, and left me wholly inflamed with a great love to God." Louise was at a loss to understand the meaning or purpose of such an account; and the suspicion crossed her mind that the saint might have mistaken some feverish dream for a reality, and, consciously or unconsciously, embellished it in narration. The seven mansions described in the "interior castle of the soul," were quite unintelligible to her, and most so of all, the seventh, the highest, where the divine bridegroom awaits the bride; where the Trinity and other mysteries become intelligible to the devotee while yet in the flesh. As to the saints' exposition of the first seven chapters of Canticles (mercifully no more than this has come down to posterity), poor Louise detected herself repeatedly falling asleep over the monotonous bombasts.

Another incident in the life of St. Teresa, added to the repugnance she already felt. It is related, that at Toledo, a young woman, who had gained a reputation of virtue, petitioned to be admitted to the habit, but added: "I will bring with me my Bible."

"What!" cried the saint, "your Bible? Do not come to us. We are poor women, who know nothing but how to spin, and to do what we are bid." This answer, much bepraised by Romanist biographers, was anything but satisfactory to Louise. She thought she should like to know something more than spinning, and practise something beside obedience. Above all, she felt a desire to see this Bible, though the book went on to say that the wish to see or to possess the Scriptures, indicated "an inclination to vanity, and dangerous curiosity and wrangling."

It will be readily supposed, that with such sentiments, Louise was far from feeling what was called "the Vocation," to take the veil. Yet she was urged to this step by Mère D'Avila with great importunity. Another circumstance which added to her discomfort at St. Joseph's was, the jealousy between the conventual confessor—a friar, and the director, a Jesuit. Loyola forbade his order to assume the direction of nunneries. But there was nothing to prevent their becoming spiritual directors, lords of the conscience, to this or that particular nun. Hence, while they admitted that the part of confessor rightly belonged only to a monk or a secular priest, they themselves assumed, in fact, that very office with far more effect. At St. Joseph's there were two parties among the nuns, a minority for the confessor, a kind-hearted old man; and a majority for the Jesuit Director Aguilar, an especial friend of Mère D'Avila's, and

young and handsome withal. Louise confessed to him a few times, after he first came; but he soon began to ask her strange and mysterious questions, and to interrogate her about thoughts which had never entered into her mind, and which she could not understand. She only felt that there must be something wicked and dreadful about his insinuations. So she went back, displeased and repentant, to the old monk; sorry that she had mortified him by forsaking him for a new comer. Aguilar had, in reality, the entire command of the convent.

There was in the house a *Sœur Angelique*—(so they Frenchified *Schwester Angelica*, for the fashion of Gallicism can penetrate the walls of a nunnery), who came hither with a breaking heart. The villany and the shameful death of her husband, who had become a gamester and a murderer, had driven her to seek in the far north forgetfulness and a grave. She had desired to be as far as possible from the place where her early days had been passed; and she thought that, in a convent, a spirit broken in the world might find medicine, at least, if not perfect cure. But she was undeceived when too late. Her sorrows, so far from finding pity, were ere long reproached as carnal; and she was expected to find relief in tattle about sister this and sister that, as though the great world and real affliction were a trifle in comparison with the infinitesimal events at St. Joseph's. She found in Louise one who could sympathize with her, who was never tired of those manifold offices of friendship with which love is busy about an invalid. Her conversations confirmed Louise in her dislike to the conventional routine, in her doubts of sacerdotal sincerity. She said, with her failing voice, her eyes unnaturally bright, and the spot of crimson upon either cheek,—“Louise, my life has stranded early on the voyage—but may it never be so with you. Your heart is too generous: your thirst for action and for kindly service too strong to permit you to endure the bondage of this house. Be sure of this; if here and there one of our sex suffers as I have done, in the endeavour to fulfil our lot in the world, such are comparatively few, we are the exceptions; many, very many more have suffered far more keenly from violating every dictate of their better nature, and living in a selfish seclusion which calls indifference and hard-heartedness spirituality. They have withdrawn their share of aid from their fellows, and happiness has in judgment left them for ever.”

She promised that Louise should have a portion of the little money she had to leave behind her, and that she would write her letters of introduction to friends at Bamberg, whence she came. She frequently repeated the words—“you are not to remain here.”

Sœur Angelique grew worse and worse. Louise was indefatigable in her attendance at her sick-bed. She felt the rich pleasure of doing good. The wish to make others happy gained strength with every effort to relieve her suffering friend. But this intimacy was observed by watchful eyes.

“My dear child,” said *Mère D’Avila* to Louise the day “you will find it written in the fourth chapter of the way of perfection, by the blessed St. Teresa, that her nuns should guard against all partiality or special friendships, the one for the other. It is an impediment to an entire resignation, it is conformity to the vain world, a sore hindrance to advance

in the dionic life. I have marked with much regret your attachment to *Sœur Angelique*. I verily believe it strengthens every day. She is no fit companion for you, my child, the world is still too much with her, those sorrows of hers are a great and culpable weakness; she needs the stimulant of a little wholesome severity. My dear child must visit *Sœur Angelique* no more."

In vain did Louise remonstrate, promise, entreat. *Mère D'Avila* gave a short frosty sigh, compounded of pious impatience and compassion at such worldliness, and, turning away, without vouchsafing farther reply, called her favorite nuns about her and proceeded to tell them her dream, while they, running the changes on all the permitted exclamations of a nunnery, expressed by ejaculations, lifted hands, and open eyes and mouths, their devout astonishment at the wondrous experiences of their superior.

Now, Louise could only recall her conversation with her friends, develope them as fancy pleased, enquire after *Angelique*, and pray for her. A stratagem she attempted to execute, so as to gain admission for an interval to her friend's apartment, was frustrated by an alteration in some arrangements, apparently made for that very purpose. Yet she received no intimation that any one had discovered her intention. Left so much to reverie, the design which the Superior sought to prevent, if she anticipated it, became continually more ardent. She wondered what *Bamberg* was like, recalled the descriptions *Angelique* had given her, called one part of the convent garden mentally by the name of that city,—imagined she had travelled thither, had found kind friends, whose kindness she was enabled to repay in some season of distress, the various particulars of which she invented likewise; and so, in thought, had left *St. Joseph's* many a hundred leagues behind. *Sœur Angelique* had travelled through *Italy*, and resided for a year at *Naples*, and her accounts of *Italy* so kindled the longing in the caged heart of Louise, that life seemed to her worthless if she could not see something more of God's earth than the garden of a nunnery contained. If she indulged in such musings in the presence of any of the rest, Louise was sure to find that the eyes of some of the sisterhood were fixed on her, as if suspicious that her reverie was more secular than religious; for in the case of the latter, the eyes should be turned up, so that little more than the white can be seen, whereas Louise generally looked down at such times.

At last it was announced that *Sœur Angelique* was dead, and a hope was expressed by the Superior that *Sœur Louise* would make amends for her previous criminal weakness, by her fortitude now. Her property was said to have been left entirely to the convent, for the repose of her soul; and not a letter, or even a message, was delivered to Louise.

When the violence of her grief had begun to abate, her purpose revived. She thought that if she could escape for an hour while the household were engaged, or dispersed, so that she might not be missed, she should be able to see for herself what *Königsberg*, and human creatures non-monastic, were like. The only free things the *Cophin* had ever seen, were the flowers, the birds and the clouds. Was not the dreaded *Mère D'Avila* herself absolutely commanded by a mysterious somebody who resided in the convent of our Lady of *Scala*, at *Rome*? It so happened

that the day on which she fixed for this first flutter into the wide world,—a timid and aimless excursion, yet one, she felt, which must have some influence in one way or another in guiding her determination—was the day so signalized by its alarming thunderstorm. She had not long left the house when the tempest broke over her head, she tried to mark her way carefully, but in the terror and confusion she lost it, and it was not till after hurrying up and down street after street, afraid to ask the way of the few dripping wayfarers who hastened by, laughed at by a crowd of men and boys who were standing at a stable-entrance for shelter, she arrived at last at the right street, drenched and terrified, and flew up the passage, to find the door hopelessly closed.

At Dr. Heinrichs' her life was for some days despaired of. The fever broke like a tide over all the barriers science could oppose. She was delirious for several days, haunted by the strangest phantasies. She thought at one time that she was the earth, that all the sorrow and passion on sea and land, in the cities and the fields, was centred in her heart, she seemed to feel the heat and chill of summer and winter rapidly, alternating,—to partake in the feeling of all the forests, and mountains, and valleys, as though they were endowed with sensation,—every interment was a pang, she shuddered at the bloodshed of a battle, and an earthquake overthrew a city;—then the sea rebelled, and the oceans joined the forces of their waves across the continents, and advanced their embattled line of foam, and after a tempestuous battle, covering the world with a dome of sheeted spray, the waters conquered, and she was buried under the seething brine. Again, she was alone in a desert, and about to perish like Ishmael and Hagar with thirst and heat; she knelt down, and there came down from the clouds upon her brow and hands a company of flakes of snow, alighting, white and soft, like fairy doves, and each infusing life as it fell and melted after its fellow. She had seen the picture of St. Francis of Assize receiving the stigmata, and it seemed to her that she, in the same attitude, was the recipient of a blessed solace that assuaged, as by a miracle, her fevered anguish. At another time, she thought herself a spirit imprisoned in one of the bubbles on the leaf of a water-plant, at the bottom of a stagnant pool.

She pined beneath the green dome in the little sphere of sickly air, and watched the strange shapes of the zoophytes, and the battles of the water-insects,—to her of giant size—creatures with jaws armed with dreadful instruments to cut and tear, and around, the curling arms of the hydras undulating every where. Then the little world in which she was a captive began to move; it detached itself from the leaf, rose up, and burst upon the surface; and she, escaping like a fairy air, ascended to the sky, and became a star, guiding the watchful mariner. One of these imaginations—to her, in her wandering and disorder, only too real—recurred with some variation more than once. She thought she was looking in the bay of Naples—before her stood the great mountain of which Sosur Angelique had so often spoken—the smoke ascended from it, and lay in a slanting line across the entire sky—a dark stripe, thinner and fainter toward the farthest west; the wind was down, and it stretched motionless over the whole hemisphere of sky, like a shadowy highway, slanting between heaven and earth. Then it appeared that this smoke

was made up of human beings, lessened by the distance to the smallest particles; the long cloud was composed of millions of men, all rising from the giant's mouth of the crater; and all, she thought, were counterparts of Aguilar—her dread—locusts, hanging in the air to be carried by the next wind down over the fields of waving grain, and the hill sides embossed by the dark-brown olive. She saw no contradiction or incongruity—a sense of an approaching work of desolation distressed her, as really as though the fruits to be devoured had been indeed souls that would be destroyed. As she looked, the shore on which she stood opened beneath her; she sank down, down, she knew not whither. When her fall was stayed, and she could look up and round, she found herself at the bottom of a great vortex, as it were, of a hollow-inverted cone; she was the lowest, the downward point of it; and the sides were all made up of living beings, stretching up above her head far as the eye could reach. They stood in rising circles on every side, in ranks that ascended spirally, widening as they rose; the last and topmost row she could discern were like those nearest her, but diminished by an immeasurable distance, and visible by a faint light that broke over from above. "Then they all passed slowly round; and, as the circles moved, she sank dizzily lower and lower; and one voice came from them all—lost! lost!—till a sudden shock and cry brought her to herself and she discerned a female face bending over her, a hand raised her head, and a strange but kindly voice spoke soothing words.

The fever passed away, and strength returned. The reader has already imagined how Louise thanked and loved the good Fran Doctoria; how the consciousness of health restored, and restored in freedom, overwhelmed her often with tearful thankfulness to God; how once free and able to follow the dictates of her heart, her cheerful self-forgetting kindness brought a new element of joy into the Doctor's quiet circle; how she was known as the benefactor of the poor, constant in her care and service for them, filling every day with efforts for others, forgetful of no one save herself; how Roger loved—ventured to tell his love, and was beloved; and how the adventure related in the last chapter was brought about by an attempt to recover Louise, set on foot by the authorities at the Seat of the Beast, as Dr. Heinrichs profanely called St. Joseph's.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN NATURE.

The Nature of Man as Spiritual, Immortal, and Responsible, will be the most frequent topic of this department: though sometimes we shall introduce MISCELLANEOUS Subjects.

THE EVIDENCE OF TESTIMONY;

AND ITS SPECIAL APPLICATION TO THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY.

TESTIMONY is the declaration of another respecting the truth of something which he professes to know. By testimony we acquire a knowledge of things from the experience of others instead of our own; believing that had we been placed in their circumstances our senses would have received similar impressions. The greater part of what we may be said to *know*, is derived from testimony. On this evidence we act with entire confidence in the most important affairs of life.

There are two ways in which testimony may prove fallacious, viz., by *mistake*, and by *wilful deception*. It admits of various degrees of credit, from moral certainty to the lowest presumption. The degree of credit due to it, in any particular case, depends on the degree of assurance we possess, that the testifier has been placed in the proper circumstances for knowing the facts; and that he possesses the honesty to declare them as they really are. When, from the nature of the case we are assured that mistake is impossible, and that no personal or relative interests could be promoted by falsehood, and that the testifier's character for veracity stands unimpeached, we then place undoubting confidence in another's declarations. Testimony is either *oral* or *written*. Written testimony is only another word for HISTORY. Authentic history is the only means by which we become acquainted with the persons and events of other times and countries. On testimony depends all our knowledge of places where we have not been; of facts and events which we have not witnessed; and of the persons, and writings, of other times and countries.

With respect to the application of this kind of evidence, our present task will be confined to verify and illustrate the point,—that it applies equally to SACRED HISTORY as to PROFANE. Historical testimony is the basis on which the truth of Christianity is founded. The miracles, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, are facts which depend on exactly the same kind of proof as the wars and death of Julius Cæsar. The writings of the Evangelists, and the Apostles, are proved authentic by the same means as those of Plato, Pliny, Plutarch, Tacitus, Herodotus, Cicero,

and Virgil. Sacred and profane history rest precisely on the same foundation; and, consequently, they stand or fall together.

But there are some persons who admit the validity of the latter as unquestionable; and yet, doubt or deny the truth of sacred history. Let us then enquire,—what is the *comparative* strength of their evidence? This point settled, will determine with what degree of *consistency* the facts, and authenticity of the New Testament Scriptures can be denied or doubted, by any who believe the records and authenticity of classical literature.

Previous to entering on this enquiry, it may be well to remark, that when, from the nature of the case, *mistake* is impossible, the truth of testimony claims our belief in proportion as we can ascertain the following things, viz:—the character of the witness, for veracity; his freedom from inducements to falsehood; the agreement between the several parts of his story; and the degree in which his statements are corroborated by the declarations of others. By these rules, the truth of testimony is determined in Courts of Justice; especially by the two latter. Criminals are often condemned to death, fairly and justly so condemned, on evidence to which all the above particulars will not apply. But, in cases where they *do* apply, testimony has attained the utmost perfection of which its nature is capable.

The man who should doubt the truths of facts thus substantiated, ought to forfeit his privilege to sit on a jury, in consequence of having virtually renounced his claim to the possession of common sense. Now, should all the above particulars appear to be fully and fairly applicable to the testimony of the Evangelists, its truth must be admitted to be thereby established on a foundation which challenges the assent of every understanding capable of appreciating the force of evidence.

It is manifest from the *nature* of the principal facts they record, that they *could not be* MISTAKEN. How, was mistake possible in witnessing the blind receive their sight; the lame, ability to walk; the deaf, the sense of hearing; or, the dumb, the power of speech? How could they be deceived in beholding the dead son of the widow arise from his bier; or Lazarus come forth from his tomb? How could they be mistaken with respect to the reality and identity of Christ's body, after his resurrection; when they received every assurance which their own senses, and his affirmation could give.

As *mistake*, then, is clearly out of the question, if the testimony of the Evangelists be *untrue*, they must have been INTENTIONAL DECEIVERS. This, however, is a supposition destitute of the least shadow of proof. On the contrary, it is evident, that the Evangelists were no deceivers, from the strict integrity of their characters, as manifested by the principles inculcated in their writings, and by the actual conduct of their lives. It is, also, clear from the fact, that their testimony, instead of tending to promote their personal interests, constantly exposed them to cruel persecutions. And it is quite certain that men will never voluntarily bring miseries upon themselves, endure sufferings, and even death itself, in attestation of what they *know* to be false. It is also manifest from the manner in which the Apostles and first Christians, agreed in the principal parts of their story; although strictly, and cruelly, examined

by the Jewish and Roman magistrates. It is also evident from the circumstance, that the testimony of the Apostles was confirmed by a number of witnesses. Nay, even the Jewish Sanhedrim itself, notwithstanding all the bitter hostility and relentless hatred, which it felt and displayed towards Jesus of Nazareth and his followers, could not deny, but fully admitted, **THE REALITY OF MIRACULOUS FACTS!** The heathen historians, especially Tacitus, Suetonius, and Pliny, mention the vast number of persons living in the time of the Apostles, who believed their testimony; and also record the sufferings they patiently endured, *solely* in consequence of that belief. From this it appears undeniable, that the Apostles and first Christians, were no *deceivers*; but that they really believed the truth of what they, with such unshaken constancy, affirmed, amidst perils, sufferings, persecution, and death.

The only question, then, on this part of the subject, that remains to be determined, is,—are the historical books of the New Testament really what they profess to be, copies of the *genuine* writings of the Evangelists?

This question may be confidently answered in the affirmative, on the following grounds :—there are at present in existence, nearly *five hundred* ancient manuscripts; some of them seven or eight hundred years old; and others probably a thousand. The books of the New Testament were so often quoted by authors immediately succeeding the Apostles, that from their writings *the whole text* might be supplied, supposing all other copies were destroyed. The Christian Scriptures were early collected into a volume, publicly read and expounded, and constantly appealed to as decisive evidence in religious controversies. Catalogues of these books were soon published; commentaries written, and translations made, which were extensively circulated in different countries.

Besides, the very *existence* of the system of Christianity, is a *fact* which cannot be accounted for with the least shadow of reason, without admitting the truth of the New Testament histories. The origin and meaning of those two distinguishing ordinances of Christianity, the Lord's Supper and Baptism, which history declares to have been observed by great numbers of persons residing in various parts of the world, for the period of eighteen centuries—are totally inexplicable on any supposition, than that the Evangelists give a true account of their institution and design.*

These considerations appear to establish two positions, viz :—(1.) That the histories contained in the New Testament are **NOT FICTIONS**; because it is manifest that the writers were **NEITHER DECEIVED THEMSELVES, NOR DESIGNED TO DECEIVE OTHERS.** (2.) That the books in question are **NOT FORGERIES**; because their **AUTHENTICITY** and **GENUINENESS**, are proved by **THE STRONGEST EVIDENCE OF WHICH THE SUBJECT IS SUSCEPTIBLE.** From this brief and rapid sketch of the evidence in favour of the Christian Scriptures, we confidently appeal to the unbiassed judgment of every man, whether the *criteria*, which render testimony perfect and complete, do not fairly apply to the writings of the Evangelists.

We now proceed briefly to enquire—what is the *comparative* strength of the evidence in favour of classical literature, and that of the New

* See Paley's Evidences.

Testament Scriptures? This will determine with what degree of *consistency* the latter can be doubted; while at the same time, and by the same persons, the former is believed.

The **AUTHENTICITY** and **GENUINENESS** of classical literature in general, is proved by evidence sufficient to satisfy every unprejudiced mind. But it may be affirmed, without fear of refutation, that its evidence is far inferior in strength and variety, to that which attends the Christian Scriptures.

The evidence in support of the **AUTHENTICITY** of classical literature, and the truth of its recorded facts, is inferior to that of the Christian Scriptures; because the nature of many of the facts recorded, and the situation of the authors for knowing them, do not so often preclude the possibility of mistake. The moral principles contained and inculcated in the classical writings, and the known conduct of their authors, do not so clearly manifest the integrity of their characters, but often the reverse. Neither is there equal proof of their exemption from interested motives in what they wrote; because there is no proof that they ever voluntarily endured persecution on account of their testimony. Few of the facts recorded by the ancient historians, were so strictly examined at the time; and none of them confirmed by so great a variety of direct and incidental proof. The evidence for the **GENUINENESS** of classical literature, is also *inferior* to that of the New Testament Scriptures in the following respects:—the number of manuscripts is not so great; and only a few are equal for antiquity. The classic writings were never so numerous, copied, so extensively circulated, so publicly read, nor transcribed with such scrupulous fidelity. The classic authors are inferior in the number of their references and quotations from each other; and in the number of languages into which they have been translated.

From those considerations it is plain, that however irrational it may be for a man to reject historical evidence altogether, it is, at least, consistent. But to believe it when applied to classical literature, and, at the same time, to doubt, or disbelieve, even a superior degree of it, when applied to the sacred writings, manifests an inconsistency that words are inadequate to express. It is an inconsistency which does violence to the clearest dictates of the understanding; and which can only be attributed to an inveterate dislike to the prominent truths which the Scriptures contain; and not to any defect in the validity of their evidence.

From what has been advanced, the obligation to believe the New Testament Scriptures is, we conceive, fairly established. The evidence of their truth and genuineness, amounts to **MORAL CERTAINTY**. But supposing it amounted only to an ordinary **PROBABILITY**, yet the obligation to believe, and act on the belief, would remain unimpaired; and that on the following grounds:—

(1) Probability is the kind of evidence which the Creator has been pleased to give for the regulation of human conduct in the general affairs of the present life. This fact affords an antecedent presumption, that God, as the Author of Revelation, would employ the same kind of evidence in making known his will to the mass of mankind, as the rule for the direction of their conduct, with respect to the life to come.

(2) All men, by their actions, declare, that probability is the kind of

evidence which they regard as being proper, and sufficient, to determine their conduct in the ordinary transactions of life; and in cases where their dearest interests, and even life itself, are at stake.

(3) The least degree of probability on one side of a question greater than that on the other, implies the corresponding obligation to believe, and act, accordingly; because a man is as truly culpable for disregarding what appears on the whole, to be his duty or interest, as for neglecting that which he certainly knows to be so. Supposing then, we admit for the argument's sake, that the evidence in favour of the truth of the Christian Scriptures, instead of MORAL CERTAINTY, only amounted to an *ordinary probability*; still the obligation to receive, and the consequent criminality in rejecting them, remain in binding force and guilty desert.

But it may possibly be objected,—“that the interposition of divine power in the working of miracles is the only proper and sufficient proof of a divine revelation; and, therefore, it is only just to demand the evidence of miracles for the truth of Christianity.”

To this we reply,—that miracles undoubtedly constitute the grand proof of divine revelation. But here it should be remarked, that hitherto we have been chiefly contending for the Christian Scriptures, *not* in their character of divine revelations, but simply as TRUE HISTORIES. And just for this reason, because the claim of the Christian Scriptures to be regarded as divine revelations is at once annihilated, if the facts they record can be proved to be false.

Admitting then, the necessity of miracles, two ways only appear conceivable by which God might establish a universal religion like Christianity. We must either evidence its truth by appealing to the senses of all men, in every age and country, by a continued series of miracles; or, some part of mankind must believe the truth of the religion on the testimony of those who witnessed the miracles in question.

On the former supposition, miracles would lose all that distinguishing character, as evidence, which they now possess; because the grand point they establish is the special interposition of divine power, in confirmation of some declared truth. But how could a series of miracles wrought before mankind in general, in all times and places, prove any special interference of the Deity. It is true that the exertion of Omnipotence might still be manifest in them; but only in the same manner as it is exhibited in the operations of nature, and the preservation of all things. The universality, or even frequency of miracles, would divest them of the grand circumstance of special interposition. They would no longer be, what their name imports, “signs and wonders” manifesting “the finger of God;” but they would rank among the ordinary events of providence, and be ascribed by men to no higher cause than “the laws of nature.”

As, then, the former supposition is incredible, we have only to suppose the employment of the latter mode in the establishment of a religion, and admit the New Testament histories as being TRUE; and then we have the strongest assurance which the nature of the case will admit, of the divine authority of the Christian religion as a revelation from heaven. If then the objector intends to demand evidence that miracles were ACTUALLY WROUGHT, his demand is indeed just, fair, and reasonable; and it is fully answered by the testimony of the Evangelists. But if he intends

to demand *present miracles* as the evidence, his demand is unjust, inconsistent, and absurd; because it is requiring a species of proof which does not properly belong to the subject.

From what has been advanced, these positions, we conceive, have been briefly but fairly established, viz.,—that TESTIMONY as fully applies to SACRED HISTORY as to PROFANE; and that THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY IS FOUNDED ON THE IMMOVEABLE BASIS OF HISTORICAL TESTIMONY.

S. E.

MIND AND MATTER: THEIR EVIDENCES AND DISTINCTIONS.

(Continued from page 286.)

WE entirely agree with Berkeley, as to our utter ignorance of matter, its nature or existence, further than our acquaintance with the impressions made upon our minds.

But here we must part company with our philosopher, and differ as to one of the conclusions he draws, namely, as to the existence of something outside our minds: which indeed he does admit, but not as natural existences, only as the divine Being directly at work, without the medium called nature, in preserving in our thoughts and senses, a certain regularity of impressions.

"But whatever power," he observes, "I may have over my own thoughts, I find the ideas actually perceived by sense, have not a like dependence on my will. When in broad daylight I open my eyes, it is not in my power to choose whether I shall see or no: or to determine what particular objects shall present themselves to my view: so likewise as to the other senses, the ideas imprinted on them, are not the creatures of my will: there is *therefore some other will or spirit that produces them.*" No doubt this inference is correct, but it leaves open to enquiry, whether this spirit, produces these impressions by a direct act, or by the intervention of the system called nature.

"There are," according to our Author, "spiritual substances, minds, or human souls, which will excite ideas in themselves, at pleasure; but these are faint, weak, and unsteady; in respect of others they perceive by sense, which being impressed upon them by certain rules or laws of nature, speak themselves to be the effect of a MIND more powerful and wise than human spirits. The latter are said to have more *reality* in them than the former; by which is meant that they are more affecting, orderly, and distinct, and that they are not fictions of the mind perceiving them. And in this sense, the sun I see by day, is the real sun, and that which I imagine by night, is the idea of the former." So then he admits of a cause from without, inasmuch as the impressions of sense, are evidently not of our own producing, but he denies that the outward cause, is any material creation, which God has made, but an operation direct which God is always carrying on. And here he gets beyond that certainty of

experience, on which he has hitherto travelled, into the region of inference, which will admit of more than one opinion.

"From all this," he concludes, "*there is a MIND which affects me every moment with all the sensible impressions I perceive.*" for if God could have made all these impressions on us, without the intervention of nature, this outward creation, would "answer no manner of purpose;" but this does not follow, since nature may answer the purpose of these impressions, nor is it certain that God always acts without means, or the employment of intermediate agency. But he enquires, "how can you suppose, that an all-powerful spirit, on whose will all things have an immediate and absolute dependence, should need an instrument in his operations, or not needing it, make use of it?" To which we reply, that God may employ instruments, which he does not absolutely need; as it is certain he does; for instance, Paul and the first preachers of the gospel, were instruments which God might have dispensed with, yet which he used; and he still employs men to teach and benefit men, though he could at once by inspiration, give all knowledge to all; and supply the temporal wants of all, without the intermediate agency of commerce, industry, and charity; therefore, being a part of God's ways, it is not contrary to his wisdom, to employ agents for doing what he could do without them.

And, consequently a material world may reasonably be supposed as the medium or occasion of those sensations, which he could produce without any world at all. And though the world is not absolutely *necessary*, as the occasion or instrument to the divine mind, it may be very well adapted, as an occasion and instrument to us. And since we must acknowledge something independent of us, as producing the regularity of our involuntary sensations; we may as reasonably acknowledge a material existence, capable of giving rise to these sensations; as indeed from sight, we reason to hardness or distance, which are not *then* objects of our senses, but of our thoughts and reasoning. And, therefore, in these cases of inference, those sensible things are *recognized without being perceived by sense*. And though as Berkeley says, we cannot conceive matter existing without a mind conceiving it: yet this conceiving is *imagination and not sense*; therefore we do conceive of sensible qualities, apart from sensible impressions, which seems an answer to his argument, as to the impossibility of external objects unperceived. And this is our conclusion on the whole question of idealism; *that God influences us by matter, of which we know only the impressions it makes upon our senses*. But these impressions do not contain in them any indications of the powers of thought; and therefore we have no reason to suppose that such powers do belong unto it; for all our descriptions and distinctions of material things, are but an account of the phenomena they present to our minds, or the effects they produce within us. That is, we are acquainted only with the surface of things, as presented to our senses; we know them only as sensations; and from the regularity of their productions, we may infer the existence of a real outward world, capable of so affecting us.

In enquiring, therefore, after the cause of our sensations, the answer is, all that we know of their nature, is from the impressions which they

produce; we know them subjectively, not objectively; and the effect they produce on our minds, is a *mixed effect*—the combined result of material and spiritual laws: outward things and the soul-sensation, is but the meeting point of these two; and the result is, a modification of their twofold nature, into a perception of colour or sound; of hardness or softness, and all the various affections of sense; which are the twofold affection of mind and matter. In this process of sensation, then, we know these two things together: the mind is conscious of an effect produced in itself, by something external; but no one will say that by this sensation we know matter better than we know mind; none at least will say so, who understand anything about the subject; and those who know nothing about it, should say nothing about it. But sensation is our only means of being acquainted with matter, whilst memory, judgment, imagination, are so many additional processes by which we understand the nature of mind, not from a modification or mixture of something else, as in sensation, but in its pure and absolute conditions and operations; so that we know matter as affecting mind; and know mind as being affected by matter; but further we know it in itself, by its undisturbed workings, of which we are daily conscious.

III. We may then enquire in the third place, into the usual way of judging respecting material objects; and distinguishing one from another.

Here we must be very brief, as it is out of our province, except as a link in the argument and illustration. Now these things are judged of by the senses; or rather by the mind, from the impression they make on the senses: this impression is the data from which we reason: thus colours are distinguished from other things, as belonging to the sense of sight; and from each other as different visual impressions: on this organ is founded the science of optics; so acoustics and music are classifications on the foundation of the sense of hearing; and those instruments which are used for testing what is too nice for one sense, are only means of bringing it under the knowledge of another: thus a thermometer is to indicate to the eye, an appearance from which the mind may judge of those nicer degrees of heat, which cannot be made sensible to the feeling. Here a process of reasoning is introduced; but its data are the appearances of vision, in the figures on the instrument; and from the appearance to sight, the mind infers the amount of another quality, which appeals to another kind of sensation—that of heat.

And here observe, that our more scientific knowledge is not so much from sense, as from a rational process, by which the mind learns more than the senses could directly tell. So that in scientific procedures, we use the senses, and from the impressions upon these, we classify objects, and deduce their general laws,—a proceeding in which there is more than a pair of eyes and physical process. viz: a mental calculation or inference.

To test a poison, the chemist must make some appearance present itself to the eye, whence the mind infers some other qualities associated with this appearance.

And in general, objects are classified according to their appearances to the senses: described by their physical or sensible properties; as that

gold is a metal, malleable of a certain specific gravity and colour; so also of silver: one thing is distinguished from another, by the effects it produces on our senses; and we might say of it, not that gold is a thing which has such and such properties; but gold is made up of such and such properties, without which, gold would be nothing; and these properties, by which one material object is distinguished from another, are simply effects produced upon our senses: in other words the phenomena they exhibit. A complete view of *what we learn from the senses, and how we learn it*, will require a separate discussion, and properly managed, would repay enquiry, since nothing could be more instructive nor more entertaining, than a strictly philosophical and thoroughly plain or popular treatment of such a topic: we may, however, content ourselves here, with classifying the three methods of learning by means of the senses. First, directly, by bare perception or reception of those impressions of sound or colour, &c., made through these senses, which are the fewest, the most confused, in which least mind is exerted, and from which least is learned. Secondly, indirectly and naturally, by those inferences which we draw from marks presented to one sense, of qualities which belong to other senses or to no senses at all. Thirdly, indirectly and scientifically, in which we *invent means and marks*, to make certain things, indicated to a sense to which they do not belong. But what we have already advanced, is enough for our present purpose, to show that we distinguish one material object from another, by the different impressions of sense, of colour, taste, feeling, or sound.

And this prepares for the fourth and last observation, namely, that for the same reasons that we distinguish one physical object from another, we must distinguish mind from all material objects: namely, because it presents altogether another class of properties, differently affects our nature.

Which may thus plainly be stated: IF A SOUND IS NOT A COLOUR, BECAUSE *one is an affection by means of the ear, and the other of the eye*; then a thought, or an emotion, a reason, or a principle, IS NOT OF THE SAME CLASS as either of these, *since we understand it by no senses at all, but by a quite different process*. We defy any materialist to bring a clearer distinction, or more complete demonstration. And here we are provided with a quotation in point, from Bishop Berkeley,—“Besides all that endless variety of ideas or objects of knowledge, (presented by the senses), there is likewise something which knows or perceives them:” “this perceiving active being, is what I call *mind, spirit, soul, or myself*.”

Now we assert that *there is a more fundamental distinction between the mind which perceives, and the things it perceives*, that there is between these things among themselves: for they are all sensible objects, though appealing to, and distinguished by different senses; but the mind is distinguished by no sense.

A sharp but not profound writer in the “British and Foreign Review,”* represents the discussion about mind and matter, as frivolous and verbal. “It is time” says he “that this dispute about materialism and imma-

* No. xxx. July, 1843. “The Modern Metaphysics and Moral Philosophy of France.

rialism, should be swept out of 'the schools.' To ask if mind be matter, is as irrational as to ask if colour be sonorous:" *then the distinction is more than verbal.* But he continues, "before we determine whether mind can be matter, we must settle our conception of matter: we cannot know its essence," but "from its phenomena we form a certain conception of matter, and in this conception either mental phenomena are included, or excluded:—"thus the dispute is purely a verbal one. We can know nothing of mind or of matter but its phenomena; it is preposterous therefore to assert that mind is either matter or spirit, for of neither matter nor spirit have we any knowledge: we know only phenomena, and name them as we please." Now in the first place, materialists, do not generally acknowledge, that we know nothing of matter but its qualities; they fancy it is known more intimately: whilst the view of things, adapted by the reviewer from immaterialists,—that we are acquainted only with any object, as far as the affections it originates in our minds,—this view does not set aside the fundamental distinction, we maintain between matter and mind. For the question is not whether we include thought, under the name matter, but whether we *ought* to do so? Whether a true definition of material objects, does include this quality. Nor may we name phenomena as we please, but attribute distinct names to distinct qualities; for though we know only phenomena, yet we may and indeed are bound to distinguish these from each other by appropriate names; and to acknowledge, that what is the occasion of sound to the ear, or colour to the eye, is not the same kind of thing, as the mind which perceives these sounds, and reasons respecting their meanings and causes.

This writer asserts that the distinction is false, or frivolous, because we know substance, material or immaterial, only by the qualities presented; as if in these qualities, we might not find the same ground for distinction; whether this be referred to a substance supporting them or not. This same reviewer speaks as if definitions and verbal distinctions, were of little value; and ridicules Condillac's "*tenet, that the culminating point of science, will be une langue bien faite:*"—a perfect language: which indeed is a good account of science—a complete or perfect language, defining and classifying things according to their true relations.

Science consists chiefly in rightly classifying things, and calling them by their proper names: but the only reason for calling two sets of things different, is from the qualities they present, or the manner in which they affect us. If names are not thus distinctive,—marking out qualities, they are of no use.

There is a better reason for calling gold, silver; than for calling mind, matter; because there is a greater distinction between the things. That philosophy which attributes various qualities, to the same substance, only confounds all distinctions, melts knowledge into uncertainties, and turns names into falsehoods.

To material phenomena, we apply one term; because there are certain mechanical laws, according to which they are produced: and *the mind can act upon them in accordance with these laws: but these things cannot operate and experiment on the mind, raise it by pulls or poison it with arsenic.* We do not detect a falsehood or ill principle by a chemical

test : nor move the will by ropes : but judge by conduct, and employ motives. A steam engine will move a physical mass : but the progress of minds is by the agency of light and truth.

These things are therefore essentially and fundamentally distinct.

Some indeed say, that mind is matter ; only with superadded qualities : but what is meant by this ? Do not additional qualities make a new thing ; for all we know of things is their qualities ? To speak of thinking matter, therefore, is as proper a use of language, as to call gold, yellow silver.

MATTER IS THE OBJECT OF THOSE LAWS WHICH CONSTITUTE NATURAL PHILOSOPHY : MIND IS THE SUBJECT OF THOSE LAWS WHICH CONSTITUTE MENTAL PHILOSOPHY ; and these different sciences, deal as much with a different substance, as acoustics and chemistry.

Many persons say, have you ever seen a soul ? to which we reply, have you ever seen a sound ? or felt one : or heard heat ; or kicked against a colour ?

Different things, are known by different means, the means suited to their nature : you have never seen love or hatred : but you may have experienced them.

And as to what *we see*,—there are many popular mistakes : we do not see distance or direction, or size, or persons ; but appearances from which we reason to the things signified : a man's eyes would be of little use, without quickness of mind : you do not see the meaning of words ; nor hear them ; meanings are not *conveyed*, but awakened by words ; the name having been associated with the meaning. We should *hear* and *see* as much if we dealt with an unknown tongue : but the mind must remember the ideas associated with such forms and sounds ; the meaning is suggested by a mental act, not perceived by the senses. Therefore it is not the ears and eyes,—but the minds, which are to make a spiritual use of a bodily impression.

Did you ever see gravitation, or hear, or taste, or smell it ? Yet if you be a true materialist, you must believe this law of your wide kingdom : but whence is it obtained ? It is a splendid generalization of that mind which you deny.

Nay even in seeing you must not deny the seed : if you disbelieve this, you might as well assert that there may be an outside, without an inside, a top without a bottom ; which is consistent enough with the material philosophy, which is all outside, and has no bottom or foundation. "It shall be called Bottom's dream because it hath no bottom."

It was a long time an axiom, that nothing exists in the understanding but what was previously in the senses : and Leibnitz added,—except the understanding itself : we would presume to add another, and complete the circle—(there is nothing in the understanding that was not previously in the sense, together as Leibnitz says with the understanding itself : and we may add,) also together with those laws or inferences, those general principles which constitute natural science, moral and intellectual philosophy, and the pure sciences of geometry, algebra and numbers. For none of these are objects of sense : they are all purely ideal.

So then in mental operations, we observe three things which distinguish mind from material qualities.

- (1.) Observation of facts.
- (2.) Inferences as to truths, general laws or principles of nature : together with questions of taste and the fine arts.
- (3.) Reflection on consciousness, or the philosophy of mind and morals ; all mental operations, states or phenomena :—the processes going on in our minds, and the principles by which they are regulated.

1. The observation of facts, is a mental process ; for matter is blind, it is seen, but it does not see. And the value of any man's observations, depends not on his eyes, but his previous knowledge and reasoning powers : only a chemist, can make a chemical observation.

2. The inferences as to truths or general laws, are a higher mental operation : by which we come from particular facts to general truths or principles, and not only see a comet, but see when it will come again, by something that can look further than by a telescope.

In the first place we may observe that this is true of poetry, literature, and the fine arts ; which are not material, not appreciated by the senses ; but an accumulation of principles, which appeal to a refined taste or cultivated understanding. By this means, a farmer, who shall know a cow very well, shall be no judge of the artistic merit of the picture of that animal : and few of this class would exchange the original for the painting, since the painting will afford no milk, and would not fetch much in the beast market : at any rate, few butchers would buy it : nevertheless, it shall stand well in the National Gallery, or any exhibition of the fine arts ; and there, shall be worth more than a whole drove.

Perhaps however these principles of taste, should rather be referred to the third department of mental operations,—reflection ; since the value of these productions, depends upon the effect they produce upon the mental susceptibilities ; just as the value of many other things depends on their adaptation to the senses, and laws of body.

But if we turn to the natural sciences, it will be found, that when we pass beyond the observation and collection of facts, which we have seen to be very much a mental process, in employing the senses ;—beyond this, all science, *as a collection of principles and general observations*, is purely a mental process, or result.

Thus for instance, astronomy, or the laws in accordance with which the heavenly bodies move ; this is entirely composed of mental inferences, as may be seen in this, that every star-gazer, is not therefore an astronomer, though if his eyes be good, he may see as much. And if you give this spectator a telescope, he will not straightway be scientific ; but must go through a long course of reasoning and investigation, to understand the principles already accumulated on this subject.

The mental or spiritual nature of science, as being a creation of the mind, and not an object of the senses,—something reasoned to, inferred, not seen, tasted, or smelled,—this truth is very plainly acknowledged by Alexander Von Humboldt, the prince of science ; as may be seen by the following observations, selected from the introduction to his *Cosmos*.

“Such a result (says he, as a knowledge of the chain of connection, linking all natural forms together) can be reaped only as the fruit of *observation and intellect*, combined with the spirit of the age, in which

are reflected all the various phases of thought.”—“Nature considered *rationally*, that is to say, submitted to the process of thought, is a unity in diversity of phenomena; a harmony, blending together all created things, however dissimilar in form and attributes; one great whole, animated by the breath of life.” This unity, is the result of our conceptions; it is an ideal creation, as indeed all unity is, even in the so-called single objects, as well as in the entire system. “Impressions,” he tells us, “change with the varying movements of the mind, and we are led by a *happy illusion*, to believe that we receive from the external world, that with which we have ourselves invested it.” And yet it is important to understand that this is an “illusion;” that we may not be deluded by the supposition of a material science, based on that groundwork of certainty which is imagined to be vainly sought in spiritual inquiries; whilst, in reality, the only certainty and beauty in science is a spiritual thing,—the inferences and ideas of the soul. This is more clearly stated by Humboldt in these words,—“We may here trace the revelation of a bond of union, linking together the visible world, and that higher spiritual world, which escapes the grasp of the senses. The two become unconsciously blended together, developing in the mind of man *as a simple product of ideal conception*, and independently of, (he should have said subsequently to), the aid of observation, the first germ of a *philosophy of nature*. This is pursuing science in the liberal spirit of a philosophy; and while discussing matter, recognizing that soul in which all is arranged. *For as the spirit of God gave form and order to the material universe, creating the outward Cosmos, so the spirit of man creates the form and order of science, the inward Cosmos*; and it is fitting that he who is made in the image of God, should create a spiritual image of a spirit’s work.

The discovery of laws, and tracing their progressive generalizations, which is described as “the object of the experimental sciences,” is only training the footsteps of the divine wisdom,—the *true* “vestiges of creation;” whilst “whatever goes beyond this physical description of the universe,” belongs to a range of still “higher speculative views.”

“Science,” says the same author, “does not present itself to man, until mind conquers matter, in striving to *subject the result of experimental investigation to rational combinations*. Science is the labour of mind applied to nature; but the external world has no real existence for us, beyond the image reflected within ourselves, through the medium of the senses. As intelligence and forms of speech, thought, and its verbal symbols, are united by secret and indissoluble links, so does the external world blend, almost unconsciously, to ourselves, with our ideas and feelings. “External phenomena,” says Hegel, in his *Philosophy of History*, “are in some degree translated in our inner representations. The objective world, conceived and reflected in us by thought (that is, turned into *subjective*), is subjected to the eternal and necessary conditions of our intellectual being. The mind exercises itself on the elements furnished to it by the perceptions of the senses.”

From all this, we may form a clear idea of what science is, namely, not an object of sense, but the production of intellect, in the *interpretation of those symbols which enter by the senses*. That, in the first place,

all we know directly of outward things, is the impression they make on our minds through the bodily organs; those sensations which are not purely material, but combine the nature of matter and spirit; and secondly, our inferences respecting those sensations, which inferences constitute the laws of physical phenomena.

If we turn from these natural sciences to the pure sciences of figure, number, and quantity in general; mathematics under the specific titles of geometry, arithmetic, and algebra, we are in the region of pure idea and abstraction, entirely amongst mental creations, which are the *only spheres of demonstration*.

THE BIBLE.

We won't give up the Bible,
 God's holy book of truth;
 The blessed staff of hoary age,
 The guide of early youth.
 The sun that sheds a glorious light
 O'er every dreary road;
 The voice that speaks a Saviour's love,
 And calls us home to God.

We won't give up the Bible,
 For pleasure or for pain;
 We'll buy the truth, and sell it not
 For all that we might gain.
 Though man should try to take our prize
 By guile or cruel might,
 We'd suffer all that man could do,
 And God defend the right!

We won't give up the Bible,
 But spread it far and wide,
 Until its saving voice be heard
 Beyond the rolling tide:
 Till all shall know its gracious power,
 And, with one voice and heart,
 Resolve, that from God's sacred word,
 We'll never, never part.

REVIEWS AND CRITICISMS.

The Age and its Architects: ten Chapters on the English People, in Relation to the Times. By EDWIN PAXTON HOOD. London: Gilpin, Bishopsgate-street. Edinburgh: A. & C. Black. Dublin: J. B. Gilpin.

"PERHAPS it would be found, if we were to test our advancement in education by the highest rules, that as yet we have scarcely begun the work at all. Do we not need more of the Fellenberg and Pestalozzian spirit in our education. Raise the character and profession of the schoolmaster; it is not surprising, that in speaking of educational agents, we give the first place to him—the great priest of instruction, to whom future generations must look up as the author of their spiritual life. Seldom in any age has his character been rightly estimated or understood; it would be quite trite and common-place, to refer to facts which prove how low was his mental and moral structure once. In our own day it is much higher, and still what is it? In how few instances is it the noble and dignified profession we feel it ought to be? How seldom is it the calling of a man's spirit? How few betake themselves to it from the love of it? Is there among the schoolmasters of Britain one who in the spirit of Fellenberg, would be content to "Live like a mendicant, that he might teach mendicants to live like men?" Our Ragged-school teachers might, perhaps, furnish to us some such noble souls; but unless appealed to by the most noble motives, how few have any attractions held out to them? In all professions where an earnest and active intellect is demanded, there is held out the prospect, in the course of years, of retiring from the profession with honour, or, at any rate, of being saved from the expectation of want. The same expenditure of intellect in any other calling would win fortunes: but expended in this, they only win for the outlay, suffering, penury, and sorrow—this is of course especially the case with the masters of the children of the poor—poor indeed is their pittance generally. The people of this country have not yet a high sense of the value of education—of the nature of it—of its profound importance. In a selfish age like ours, how can it be otherwise? Men who spend one shilling or two shillings per week in tobacco and ale, those pestilential curses and fumes, evidencing manners and morals equally degraded, spend perhaps twopence, most likely nothing, weekly on the school-room, that great fountain and temple of blessings to the community. This is disgraceful! For it is the duty of every man, not only to give an education, but the very best that he can give, in proportion to his means. The schoolmaster then is the most important person of any age; upon him depends what the next shall be; he will give, if any will give, right and just ideas to the future times of the world.

"Who can wonder that Protestant opinions in the sixteenth century made high headway against the opinions of Rome, when he finds that the report of the Inquisition reckons 3000 schoolmasters as attached to them. The schoolmaster has to train (and how important is that duty) the mind of the child to obedience and law. Normal colleges can do nothing for him like what he can do for himself; he will best fit himself for his office by prayer, by frequent mental communion, by a careful study of the minds of his children, by hearty earnestness, (this is more than intellectual,) by belief in his own authority and power, and by knowledge of the human heart and its subtleties. The idea of the schoolmaster should be extended to all those who in any place attempt to train the mind of youth; their work makes them venerable, be they ever so young, when the work is undertaken, in faith, in reliance, in a noble sense of duty. We are quite aware that, perhaps, in connexion with no office has there been the utterance of so much of the merely theoretical, as in connexion with the schoolmasters; at the hazard of again appearing guilty of this, we will say it is his solemn and sacred office to take the child by the hand as a tender parent, and thus to give it the first distinct views of the purpose, the severity, and the earnestness of life."

The Age and its Architects, is a work fraught with much information, and displays sound reasoning, and we heartily recommend it.

I.

CHRIST'S RELIGION.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD." 1 Thess. v. 12.

THE TRUE APOSTLES' CREED;

OR THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON OF LIFE AND DOCTRINE;—
TRUTH IN JESUS.

"WHAT is truth?" is the most important question that can be asked by a reasonable being; and a fair clue to the answer, a thread to guide through the labyrinth of human theories and speculations, would constitute a great boon to anxious enquirers. We do not profess to have furnished such a clue, but to have pointed out more clearly and distinctly, THE CLUE WHICH GOD HAS FURNISHED; who "has spoken to us by his Son," as "the truth" for mankind.

By this Canon therefore, our search is narrowed, being concentrated upon one person, instead of directed to the Babel—voices of human pretenders.

In reference to religion, if we accept the gospel at all as our standard, we must find all truth in Jesus; for his religion is truly called CHRISTIANITY, a doctrine worship and course of duties founded on CHRIST himself; and therefore named CHRIST—*ianity*.

The reality of this rule of truth, as a scriptural directory, has already been exhibited; and the preliminary deductions from it have been pointed out; viz., *the want of authority in any other standard whatever*, whether creeds, priests or Churches.

(3) We shall now endeavour to APPLY THE EXCLUSIVE RULE or Canon THUS ATTAINED: in other words, to indicate some of those truths discoverable in the infallible rule afforded in the character and mission of Jesus Christ.

We regard this rule as *the great* THEOLOGICAL ORGANON, or instrument of enquiry and discovery in religious matters.

The proper application of it, will tend to the unity of the faith, and of the faithful under the "one head," as "of HIS FULNESS we all receive."

In the very commencement of our investigations by the light of this gospel Canon, we are taught to lay aside not only the rule of creeds and human standards;—the authority of priests; but also (which is more difficult with some, not to say dangerous for the advocates, from the impatience and prejudice even of pious minds)—TO DISCRIMINATE IN THE

SCRIPTURES THEMSELVES, what part is obviously local and temporary, and what part is the eternal light for mankind.

Here we have the great Apostle of the Gentiles as our inspired director, teaching us that the rites of Judaism, and all belonging thereto, were intended for the Jews alone; whilst the *new law is founded on the new priesthood* of Jesus Christ.

Thus is the Bible, (including under this term, the Old and New Testaments) as an ear of corn; wrapped about with chaff, to be thrashed, and winnowed, and ground; till we come to the pure grain or rather the refined flour;—which is in Jesus Christ himself in all his offices.

And let none misapprehend this, even though all be not able to receive it: the truth of it was plainly taught dramatically by our Lord, at his transfiguration; *when Moses and Elias were taken away*; and the disciples "*saw no man, SAVE JESUS ONLY*;" and heard a voice from the excellent glory,—"*this is my beloved Son, hear him*," and leave Moses and the prophets; whose work was—to introduce the Saviour to speak for himself.

The great advantage of the Canon here advocated, is seen in its application, as simplifying enquiry after religious truth; by excluding every other standard, and confining our attention to the Saviour, who is himself "the truth."

The lessons to be learned from studying Christ, may be classified as follows:—

1. The truths in Jesus, as representative of the divine nature and will:—what God is in Christ.

2. The truths in Jesus, as indicative of man's natural condition, his redeemed and glorified state:—what dangers, duties, and hopes of mankind, are symbolized in the human character of Jesus.

3. The truths in Jesus as to the means by which man may attain to the regenerate character and glorified condition of which Christ is an example and pledge.

We have thus opened before us a wide and interesting field of enquiry—what may be learned respecting God and man, in Emanuel, God with us.

We do not profess to exhaust these subjects, but only to lay down a map for enquiry; with a slight description of the various regions referred to. The full meaning of the three divisions adopted above, together with their mutual relations, will, we trust, be evident as we proceed; whilst we hope that the interest and importance of the subject will repay all the patience required in the perusal.

1. We propose to examine the lessons or truths in Christ, respecting the divine nature and will.

Here the Saviour stands as the representative of the Godhead, in its spiritual relations to mankind; as "God manifest in the flesh,"—"God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself."

The divine nature in its absolute character, is undiscoverable and *ineffable*; but it is here shewn forth and declared, in its relation to the world. "No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him,"—exhibited his attributes of mercy and holiness. When the world had forgotten

the Creator in vain images of his attributes, and so could no longer interpret the signs of "his eternal power and Godhead," which God ever "shewed unto them" in his manifold works;—when they worshipped the hosts of heaven, and the earth itself with its various regions and elements; then he who had written his truth with his own finger on the tables of nature, placed his teaching in the mind of man, to whom he dictated for record in a book (as the refutation of superstition and vain philosophy)—"in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

And to perpetuate this truth amongst men, God chose a nation out of the world, in whose ordinances he placed symbols of still further manifestations: whilst by spiritual communications through the prophets, he gradually unfolded his plans, to enlarge, spiritualize, and prepare the minds of the devout (who waited for salvation in Israel) to anticipate and welcome the last dispensation.

And then came the end, in which all spiritual truth, was condensed into one living character, in the person, conduct, and mission of Jesus Christ our Redeemer. "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by *his Son*, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of *his glory*, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high."—(Heb. i. 1—3.)

It is *not merely by the mouth* of the Saviour, that God hath spoken to us; but most emphatically **BY THE PERSON OF THE SAVIOUR**, by his work, character and mission; **BY CHRIST HIMSELF**; who is **THE WORD**,—(John i. 1.)—the fullest utterance and clearest expression of the Godhead to the world; the brightness of the Father's glory, in his moral nature; the express image of the invisible God; in fine, *God made visible*, displaying or manifesting himself in the flesh,—as a man dealing with men. "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him. Philip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou *then*, shew us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works."—(John xiv. 7—10.)

Here our Lord tells us, that to know him, is to know the Father; *to see one, is to see the other*. Thus he came to shew us the Father; by shewing himself; in whom the Father dwelt, by whom the Father spoke and acted: therefore "from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him." "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also."—(John viii. 19.)

Accordingly, we find the Saviour claiming for himself and receiving from his disciples a position of importance and supremacy, "to which every knee is to bow—to the glory of God the Father,"—(Philip. ii. 10, 11.)—*who is honoured in his Son*; "that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father."—(John v. 23.)

Few expressions are so peculiar, as some of those in which our Lord makes a kind of interchange between his own honour and that of his Father, as though they were convertible phrases used in apposition, the latter being explanatory of the former:—thus he observed respecting Lazarus—“this sickness is not unto death, but *for the glory of God, [i. e.] that the Son of God might be glorified thereby.*”—(John xi. 4.) The glory of God, is here the glorifying of his Son.

The most striking expression respecting the interchange of glory belonging to Christ and the Father, in the following:—“Jesus said, now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in him; (*i. e.* in the humanity of Christ, and the work accomplished in that vehicle on earth.) If God be glorified in him (*i. e.* in the assumed form of man,) God shall also glorify him (the Redeemer) in himself; (*i. e.* in God; in the resumption of that majesty from which Christ had descended to the “fashion as a man;”) “and shall straightway glorify him.”—(John xiii. 31, 32.)

These may perhaps appear to many to be passages of as much difficulty as interest, still they serve as important lessons and fertile suggestions respecting the relation between Christ and his Father; whose character the Saviour displays, and whose place he takes as the authority for mankind: the Redeemer and judge of the world.

For the Father “hath given him *authority to execute judgment also, BECAUSE he is the Son of Man.*” (John v. 27.) it is not without earnest consideration and wide comparisons that we can reach the depth of meaning contained in this statement,—the reason for transferring all judgment to Christ,—“*because he is the Son of Man.*” This indicates to us one grand feature in the philosophy of the gospel; the condescension and accommodation (so to speak) of the divine nature to our condition; to gain a hold upon mankind by the medium of our common humanity; to establish a moral sway, and lay the foundation for a manifest right and fitness to judge the world, through this effort to redeem the world, by assuming the form of the “Son of Man.”

Because the Redeemer “made himself of no reputation,” “and was made in the likeness of sinful men,” and suffered upon the cross,—“*wherefore God hath highly exalted him:*” (Philip ii. 6—11.) not only was this necessary, in order to secure a sacrifice,—“a body hast thou prepared me,” “lo I come to do thy will O God;” (Heb. x. 5—7.) but it was equally necessary to express a sympathy towards mankind; and to secure sympathy in return. This is clearly taught in the Epistle to the Hebrews:—“but we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man. Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on *him the nature of angels*; but he took on *him* the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto *his* brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things *pertaining* to God, to make reconciliation for the

sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.”—(Heb. ii. 9, 14—18.)

So then “*because* he is the Son of Man,” he is fitted to deal with the sons of men, whilst he also is more adapted to the great purpose of displaying the truth respecting God, in his relation to humanity.

The transference of the judgment of mankind to the Saviour “*because* he is the Son of Man,” and as such died for mankind, is an obvious instance of moral fitness,—that men should be responsible to the author of their privileges. And this doctrine we find stated very expressly in Rom. xiv. 4—12, 18.

Here we learn that our responsibility is transferred from God in nature, to God in Christ;—and that to “stand before the judgment seat of Christ,” is to “give an account to God:” (v. 10, 12.) and therefore in Christ we are to find the truth respecting God, as the ruler of this world: whilst the ground for this transference of our responsibility—the claim of the Redeemer on our obedience is, that as the Son of Man, *he died and rose again, THAT HE MIGHT BE LORD*:—the judge of the world.

“For the priesthood being changed, there is of necessity a change of the law:” (Heb. vii. 12.) which is now based on the priesthood of Jesus Christ. Thus is the Father glorified in the Son, and all the divine will regarding man, made manifest in Jesus Christ: the love of God, his justice; his final judgment, his present requirements and the privileges he freely offers.

And this is why our Lord is made so personally prominent, in his own teaching and in that of his Apostles: the New Testament, is “the gospel of God concerning his Son,” (Rom. i. 1, 3.) an account of the Saviour: hence Christ ever gave himself as the lesson and authority, demanding that we should acknowledge him,—“whosoever denies ME before men, him will I deny before my Father.” What think ye of Christ, he enquired; and again “whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?”—“unless ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.”

The Apostles declared, “we preach not ourselves, but (we preach) Christ Jesus the Lord;” whilst the Saviour preached himself, and commissioned others to do the same: and prayed that they might behold his glory, and they did behold it,—“the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and *truth*:” for “the law was given (conveyed) by Moses, but grace and *truth* came (into existence, originated for man) by Jesus Christ.”

Everywhere we find the sacred writers abasing themselves and exalting the Saviour, in the spirit of John the Baptist—“he must increase, but I must decrease:” “no man hath ascended into heaven (to learn divine truth) but one has descended from heaven (to display that truth in himself) even the Son of Man, whose abode is in heaven:” and “he who cometh from heaven is above all”—the only infallible teacher; the unchangeable truth.

As the Jewish law was the covenant of Jehovah, so the New Testament is the covenant of Jesus;—“the New Testament in my blood”—to display and ratify the mercy of God,—“shed for many for the remission of sins;” so that the whole truth respecting the divine character, the will of God relating to man, is to be found in a right understanding

of the Saviour. And this was "the promise of the Father," as well as the hope held out by Christ to console his disciples on the prospect of his departure; "it is expedient for you that I go away," in order to send "the Spirit of the truth," who "will guide you unto all truth.—(John xvi. 7—13.) What then was *this truth* into which the spirit was to lead the Apostles? It was nothing else but A TRUE ACCOUNT OF THE SAVIOUR HIMSELF; men had rejected him, the disciples had not fully understood him; but the Holy Ghost was to teach the Apostles, all the truth respecting the Redeemer;—"He shall not speak of himself"—"*He shall GLORIFY ME*, for he shall receive of mine, and shew it unto you."—(John xvi. 13, 14.) And in this truth or explanation of what the Saviour is, we shall find the whole truth respecting the Father, a complete knowledge of God; for "all things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he (the Holy Ghost) shall take of mine and shew it unto you."—(v. 15.)

Thus we arrive at the first class of truths to be found in Jesus Christ; namely the true account of the divine character, "all things that the Father hath" for this world: we are consequently to see in the Redeemer, the truth of God's majesty, condescension, holiness, and mercy: and to find every obligation, every privilege, treasured up in Jesus Christ; by whom we have a throne of grace, and to whom we shall have to give an account at the throne of judgment.

We shall therefore miss the whole meaning and ~~main~~ purpose of Christianity, if we seek to see the Father in any other ~~manifestation~~ than in Jesus Christ; or to know the divine will respecting ourselves in any other medium than this here presented;—"grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

II. PRIESTS' RELIGION.

HUMAN AUTHORITY AND INVENTION *versus* CONSCIENCE AND THE BIBLE.

The Scriptures are the only standard of Christian faith and practice: every one is at liberty to examine them; but no one is at liberty to decline this examination: and though we may receive the help of others, we may not rest on their authority, (which is man-worship;) nor receive as religion, what is not in the Scriptures, (which is will-worship.)

ST. PHILIP NERI, FOUNDER OF THE ORATORIAN,— HIS "MAXIMS AND SAYINGS."

THE Fathers and Brothers of the Oratory, compose a sect of the Roman Heresy, founded by the great St. Philip Neri; and, as in our preceding number we referred to the physical picture of that illustrious saint, our readers may have been sufficiently enchanted to desire his mental picture.

But since the Romanist orators complain of the man drawing the picture of the Lion, St. Philip shall paint himself; and stand in so many presentation copies before our readers; that they may estimate the vigour and sanity of his intellect, as well as the Scriptural nature of his piety, and the truthful teachings of that Church which has canonized this prodigy.

The Oratorian sect seems a favorite fraternity with the perverts from Protestantism, hence it is the asylum of Dr. Newman, and the Rev. H. Wilberforce, the veritable modern Swallowell. Father Faber has also joined this sect, and favoured us with a translation of his founder's "Maxims and Sayings;" they are not so anxious to give us translations of the Maxims and Sayings of THE FOUNDER of *Christianity*; they prefer their own *modern new-fangled* HERESIARCHS; and hence in the Maxims of Philip, whilst we are often directed to human guides; to the "lives of *saints*," we are not directed to read the life of Christ: this line of reading is completely "ignored" by our Roman originator of modern superstitions: and instead of the works of the inspired Apostles, being recommended to our perusal, we are favoured with such direction as is set down for the "spiritual repast," to be enjoyed on Aug. 28th.—

"It is very useful for those who minister *the word of God*, or give

themselves up to prayer, *to read the works of authors whose names begin with S*, such as *Saint Augustine, Saint Bernard.*"

Why those who *minister the word of God*, should seek their nourishment in the word of man, is not explained to us; but it is one of the "first principles;" of our Roman Oratory. There are many persons whose "names" *should* "begin with S," which stands for silly.

We shall let our readers judge for themselves, respecting the wisdom of this papal Solomon; and his follower, the Rev. F. W. Faber, shall introduce the saint to their notice, by the preface appended to the English version of Philip's "Maxims and Sayings."

"The following passages are a translation of the Ricordi e Detti di San Filippo Neri, published at Turin. Their purpose cannot be better described than in the words of the Italian editor: 'it was the aim and study of the holy father Philip Neri, to introduce among Christians a daily *spiritual repast*. His children, who *have drunk of the spirit of THEIR* holy father, have always sought to cultivate this custom of a spiritual repast among devout persons; and among the plans which they have tried and the practices they have introduced, one, *gentle Reader, is a collection of the sayings and doings of the Saint, distributed into the number of the days of the year*, to the end that every one might have each day, either a maxim to meditate upon, or a virtue to copy. The method of using these sayings and doings, is to read only one of them each day, and that the one set apart for the current day, (for to read more would *not be food, but curiosity*;) and then to regulate the actions of the day by that maxim or example. I am sure that by doing this you will reap an abundant harvest, *especially if to the maxim or example you add some particular devotion to the Saint* who was the author of it. I think it useless to make any long commendation of this practice; but it is well you should know that by the daily suggestion of such truths, the fruit which the Saint obtained in Rome was immense; and so also will it be in your soul if you practise it in a true spirit of devotion. Farewell.'"

F. W. FABER.

As these promises may have set the reader longing, we will not mock his appetite by promises and descriptions; he shall have some of the real apples of Sodom, as they are plucked ripe from this fertile tree of deception: there are several "manner of fruits,"—good and bad; **THE GOOD TO TEMPT, THE BAD TO POISON.**

This is ever the method of Satan's working, whether he quote Scripture to the Saviour, or send forth "Pseudo-Apostles, deceitful workers, fashioning themselves to the outward shape of Apostles of Christ. And no wonder, for Satan (their master) transforms himself into (the appearance) of an angel of light."—(2 Cor. xi. 13, 14.)

We cannot better exhibit this two-fold feature, or Janus-like *double-face method*, than by placing in parallel columns the truths and the falsehoods, the gilding and the pill, the sheep's clothing and the wolf's snout, the spiritual garb and the cloven foot;—the Bible and the devil.

The specimens will be numbered according to the day of the month, as they occur for *devotional* reading.

Truths and nullifying falsehoods; or, THE APOSTLE'S MANTLE
and THE CLOVEN FOOT.

Jan. 6.—"HE WHO WISHES FOR ANYTHING BUT CHRIST, DOES NOT KNOW WHAT HE WISHES; he who asks for anything but Christ, does not know what he is asking; he who works, and not for Christ, does not know what he is doing."

May 14.—"As much love as we give to creatures, just so much we steal from the Creator."

Oct. 18.—"The perfection of a Christian consists in knowing *how* to mortify himself *for the love of Christ*."

March 25.—"Our sweet Christ, the Word Incarnate, has given Himself to us FOR EVERY THING THAT WAS NECESSARY FOR US, even to the hard and ignominious death upon the cross."

July 2.—"Our Blessed Lady is the dispenser of all the favours which the goodness of God concedes to the sons of Adam."

Aug. 5.—"To begin and end well, devotion to our Blessed Mary, the Mother of God, is nothing less than indispensable."

Sept. 24.—"Be devout to the Madonna, keep yourself from sin, and God will deliver you from your evils."

Sept. 7.—"To obtain the protection of our Blessed Lady in our most urgent wants, it is very useful to say sixty-three times, after the fashion of a Rosary, 'Virgin Mary, Mother of God, pray to Jesus for me.'"

Jan. 23.—"Our Blessed Lady ought to be our love and our consolation."

July 16.—"He whose health will not permit him to fast in honour of Christ and our Blessed Lady, will please THEM much more by giving some alms more than usual."

March 13.—"The best remedy for dryness of spirit, is to picture ourselves as beggars in the presence of God and the Saints, and like a beggar, to go first to one Saint, then to another, to ask a spiritual alms of them with the same earnestness as a poor fellow in the streets would ask an alms of us."

March 14.—"We may ask a spiritual alms even corporally, by going first to the Church of one Saint, and then to the Church of another, to make our petition."

Feb. 1.—"He who wishes to be wise without the true Wisdom, or saved without the Saviour, is not well, but sick—is not wise, but a fool."

July 25.—"He who works *purely for the love of God, desires nothing but His honour*, and thus is ready in every thing either to act or not to act, and that not in indifferent matters only, but even in good ones; *and he is always resigned to THE WILL OF GOD.*"

Oct. 7.—"He who wishes to go to Paradise must be an honest man and a good Christian, *and not give heed to dreams.*"

Feb. 2.—"Devotion to the Blessed Virgin is *actually necessary*, because there is NO BETTER MEANS OF OBTAINING GOD'S graces than through His most holy mother."

June 10.—"It is a good thing, during the week that follows our Communion-day, to do something more than usual; for example, to say five Our Fathers AND HAIL MARYS *with our arms extended, or an extra rosary.*"

Dec. 7.—"The Holy Spirit says (?) of *prelates and pastors, He who hears and obeys them, hears and obeys ME*, and he who despises THEM, despises and disobeys ME."

Dec. 8.—"If the servant of God would fain walk with more security through so many snares scattered in every place, *he should have our Blessed Lady as HIS MEDIATRIX WITH HER SON.*"

These are sufficient specimens of the theology, piety, and consistency of the blessed St. Philip; and in reference to them the Redeemer and Judge will say,—"*OUT OF THINE OWN MOUTH WILL I JUDGE THEE, THOU WICKED SERVANT,*" for if God has given us Christ as a Mediator, why should we have a *mediator between us and a mediator*? If "he who wishes for anything but Christ, does not know what he wishes," (Dec. 6.) why should you go "like a beggar, first to one saint, then to another?" (March 13.)

If "the word incarnate has given himself to us, *for everything that was necessary for us,*" (March 25) why do you introduce Mary and the saints, and the confessor, and make them both useful and essential?

Besides these (1) contradictory "*Maxims and Sayings*" of this perverter of God's truth; we may select a few under the heads of (2) nonsensical or foolish; (3) infamous, and (4) tyrannical and slavish.

Amongst the foolish or nonsensical (to which indeed the whole have an affinity,) we may notice April 1.—

"To acquire and preserve the virtue of chastity, we have need of a good and experienced confessor."

This is proper for April fools' day; since nothing tends more to inflame evil desires than to talk about them; above all, to answer the debasing questions connected with the confessional.

The same is true of the direction for March 31.—

"A most excellent means of keeping ourselves pure, is to lay open all our thoughts, as soon as possible, to our confessor, with the greatest sincerity, and keep nothing hidden in ourselves."

The very prominence given in directions, confessions, and instructions, to carnal indulgences, is of itself adapted to foster them; but the gospel gives a few clear and forcible principles, on guarding our thoughts, and then trusts to other motives and indirect means to pre-occupy and fortify the mind; whilst the Roman books and discipline lay an ardent and burning siege to human virtue.

The insolent doctrine laid down for March 29, we leave to our fair readers; it is a libel on ladies, and is contradicted by the women who ministered to Christ, wept around his cross, and early attended his tomb: of these the *saint* observes:—

March 29.—"The devil generally makes use of the weaker sex when he wishes to cause us to fall."

This is a true monk's doctrine, and also is accordingly a false doctrine; whilst monks have no right to speak of "the weaker sex," for women are stronger than they, both in sense and virtue.

The following reflection, comes fairly under the nonsensical division, for none can by any possibility know what it means.

April 20.—"Let the sick man *enter into* the Side of Jesus *and His most holy Wounds*; let him not be afraid, but combat manfully, and he will come forth victorious."

This is nothing better than making a mock of the Redeemer's sufferings; it is imitating those who cried out, "prophecy unto us, who is he that smote thee?"

What thoughtful Christian, can read the following puerile priestly play upon words, as if in order to bring the last sufferings of the Redeemer into contempt and ridicule, without feelings of the deepest sorrow, humiliation and disgust?

May 4.—"Let us concentrate ourselves so completely in the divine love, and *enter so far into the living fountain of wisdom through the wounded Side* of our Incarnate God, that we may deny ourselves and our self love, and so be unable to find our way out of that Wound again."

The utter imbecility of this patron saint, may be estimated from the next pious meditation:—

Oct. 4.—"We ought to desire to be in such a condition as to want sixpence, and not be able to get it."

This is perhaps equal in sanity to the grave declaration for Aug. 23.—

"We ought to desire the VIRTUES of prelates, cardinals, and popes, but not their DIGNITIES."

Now their "dignities" are better than "their virtues;" and if *we* ought not to desire their dignities, ought THEY to desire them? In truth we ought to desire *neither*, for one is as bad as the other.

But we must hasten to give a few specimens of the (3) *Infamous*, from these "Maxims," and here as usual, we have a cross division, for nearly all are infamous; still we may classify if not the Maxims, at least their qualities.

Amongst the infamous Maxims, then, we may surely reckon the following:—

June 25.—“*He who cannot put up with the loss of his honour, can never make any advance in spiritual things.*”

In other words, a man must be willing to be proved a falsifier, or anything else, without clearing himself; but willingly submit to the degradation, as the passive instrument of priestly projects.

The infamy of the above Maxim, is equalled by that set down for Feb. 11.—

Feb. 11.—“*Every one ought to give in readily to the opinion of another, and to argue in favour of another and against himself, and take things in good part.*”

The repeat of Nov. 6, appears to add an unusual portion of meanness to the usual infamy:—

“*He who really wishes to become a saint must never defend himself, except in a few rare cases, but always acknowledge himself in fault, even when what is alleged against him is untrue.*”

The instances of (4) slavish Maxims, are sufficiently abundant; we shall set down a few of them, *they all constitute the most severe charges against the Roman heresy*,—in Rome’s own sainted language:—

Jan. 16.—“*They who really wish to advance in the ways of God, must give themselves up into the hands of their superiors always and in everything; and they who are not living under obedience, must subject themselves of their own accord, to a learned and discreet confessor, whom they must obey in the place of God, disclosing to him with perfect freedom and simplicity the affairs of their soul, and they should never come to any resolution without his advice.*”

Jan. 17.—“*There is nothing which gives greater security to our actions, or more effectually cuts the snares the devil lays for us, than to follow another person’s will, rather than our own, in doing good.*”

Jan. 19.—“*When the devil has failed in making a man fall, he puts forward all his energies to create distrust between the penitent and the confessor, and so by little and little he gains his end at last.*” (!)

Feb. 4.—“*HE WHO ALWAYS ACTS UNDER OBEDIENCE, MAY REST ASSURED THAT HE WILL NOT HAVE TO GIVE AN ACCOUNT OF HIS ACTIONS TO GOD.*”

This *should* have been—we must not trust ourselves, our own passions or speculations, but examine God’s word. “He who trusts to his own heart, is a fool,” and he is equally a fool who trusts to the heart of another; the text means, that all men are liable to delusion, and we are all equally to seek *divine* guidance. The slavish tendency of the Popish misapplication of distrust in ourselves, is in leading us to trust in priests, instead of *distrusting all men and relying on the wisdom of God*—the same principle is involved in the Maxim for May 11.—

“*The scrupulous should remit themselves always and in every thing to the judgment of their confessor, and accustom themselves to have a contempt for their own scruples.*”

The one prepared for June 15, is a grave falsehood;—

“*He who conceals a grave sin in confession, is completely in the devil’s hands.*”

Now, on the contrary, he who does not conceal, but commits his case

to the priest, is in the devil's hand, who employs priests to keep men from God and Christ. And yet the saint assures us, in his Maxim for Oct. 11, that—

"The devil, who is a most haughty spirit, is never more completely mastered than by humility of heart, and a simple, clear, undisguised manifestation of our sins and temptations to our confessor."

Whereas in truth, the devil never more completely triumphs, than when a sinner thinks he has buried his guilt in the priest's ears.

But to secure the most abject subserviency to the priestly despotism; men's minds are poisoned with such Maxims as that for Nov. 22.—

"There is nothing more dangerous in the spiritual life, than to wish to RULE OURSELVES AFTER OUR OWN WAY OF THINKING."

After whose "way of thinking" then, are we to be ruled? After that of our priest confessor, or spiritual superior—of course: but if it be evil to follow our own way of thinking, whose way do the confessors follow? Their own? *And where is the advantage of the ability of thinking, if we are not to follow it?* Does not every son of the Church, follow his own way of thinking, when he follows the Church, *because HIS OWN PRIVATE OPINION is that the Church is right?*

No doubt this is "dangerous to their spiritual life," and nothing would more conduce to their souls health, than no longer to be ruled by their "own opinion" that Rome is a safe guide; and abandoning this folly of "trust in themselves," (April 12.) submit to the wisdom of that great saint, Luther, and his predecessors, Paul, Peter, &c. with all the followers of their piety and teaching.

But what is the Pseudo-Saint Philip's purpose in such maxims, is it to lead men to a wise and devout reliance on safe instructions? No! But to blindfold the world, that priests may abuse it. According to these principles, REASON is the *grand element of sin in our constitution*; and our sanity as well as holiness, consists in bidding farewell to our understanding, as the proper introduction and security of the priesthood of Rome, whose throne is built out of the relics and fragments of the intellectual faculties of mankind.

Perhaps however, it will be retorted, that Roman priests do not lead men away from Christ; for they declare that the priest is Christ, or at least as good, so men have as many Saviours as confessors! *Thus is their piety covered by blasphemy, AS THEY HONOUR THE SAVIOUR BY TAKING HIS PLACE!* Accordingly St. Philip declares, Dec. 2.—

"When we go to confession, we ought to persuade ourselves to find Jesus Christ in the person of our confessor."

If this be true, there is a sufficient reason for men to lay aside their *own reason* in matters of religion, and follow the direct guidance of the Saviour in the confessor; only they must first lose their reason before they can believe in this infallible guide.

We see then why those slavish principles are inculcated; why men are not to trust themselves, viz., because they should trust the priests, who also are men, and by the like reason not to be trusted, either with their own spiritual affairs, or those of other people: but these priests, to escape the inconsistency, get beyond the province of humanity, and tell us to see the Saviour in them!

And Saint Philip crowns this blasphemy towards God, and insolence

towards the world, by absolutely recommending AS A VIRTUE THE MORTIFYING OF OUR UNDERSTANDING.

Now *what part of our nature*, is to set up and mortify our reason? *It must be some part that is not reasonable*, and therefore the recommendation of Saint Philip is absurd. Reason is to be governed, by what is not reason! Protestants may be unable to believe that such things are taught expressly by a *canonized* saint, whose works are recognized by the Church which canonized him; and who is the founder of a flourishing Roman sect, the Oratorians.

And whilst Protestants may find it hard to believe this, Romanists would not scruple to deny it, unless they feared that St. Philip's book was at hand, to give them an opportunity of blushing. But this little book from which we are now quoting, "the Maxims and Sayings of St. Philip Neri; arranged for every day in the year, and adapted to the feasts of the Church, from the Italian, by the Rev. F. W. Faber, WITH AUTHORITY;" is surely authority enough. Besides this part of the title page, there is a device with this circular motto, "*Sancte Wilfride Ora pro Nobis.*" Holy Wilfrid pray for us. Mr. Faber's preface is dated "St. Wilfrid's, Feast of St. Bridget."

These are illustrious persons; and the book (which may be carried in the waistcoat pocket) is published by Thos. Richardson and Son, London. Our readers may therefore easily carry about with them this little pocket companion, and point out to Romanists, the passages we have referred to, as well as the following, which crown the whole by taking away the crown of reason, the crown of humanity, that in our imbecile condition, we may prostrate ourselves before the priest, "*And crown HIM Lord of all.*"

June 28.—"Those who pay a moderate attention to the mortification of their bodies, *and direct their main intention TO MORTIFY THE WILL and UNDERSTANDING*, even in matters of the slightest moment, *are more to be esteemed than they who give themselves up exclusively to corporal penances and macerations.*"

July 29.—"A man ought TO MORTIFY HIS UNDERSTANDING in little things, if he wishes easily to mortify it in great ones, and to advance in the way of virtue." (!)

Aug. 22.—"A man should not so attach himself to the means as to forget the end; *neither must we give ourselves so much to mortify the flesh as to forget to mortify the brain, which is the chief thing after all.*"

Nov. 5.—"THE SANCTITY OF A MAN LIES in the breadth of three fingers, (the forehead,) that is to say, in MORTIFYING THE UNDERSTANDING, *which would fain reason upon things.*"

We shall take advantage of some observations that have already appeared on these and similar maxims, in the fourth "Oration to the Oratorians,"* the first of which was noticed in our last number.

Speaking of Father Newman's doctrine of persecution, the Protestant orator proceeds:—

"To prevent the occurrence of persecution," observes the Father, 'she (meaning the Church) must head a movement which it is impossible

* Orations to the Oratorians, being a Supplement to the Rev. Dr. Newman's Lectures on "Catholicism in England;" by the Rev. BREWIN GRANT, B.A. London: Ward and Co. Twopence each.

to suppress,'—and then there will be no persecution, for she will effectually suppress all heretical thoughts, crucify reason in the cradle, make all men religiously imbecile, and then there will be no one possessing sense, soul, or courage to encounter persecution. And this will be the Millennium for which St. Philip, of Neri, the patron saint of the Oratorian, seems to long,—in his 'Maxims and Sayings,' where he tells us that,—'in order to be really obedient [*i. e.* to our human superiors] it is not enough to do what obedience demand, we must do it *without reasoning upon it.*' (Jan. 22.)

"And again, 'a man ought to MORTIFY HIS UNDERSTANDING, in little things, if HE WISHES TO MORTIFY IT IN GREAT ONES, and to advance in the way of virtue.' (July 29) In other words, according to St. Philip, the greatest saint is the greatest fool,—having a mortified understanding! Now the Bible tells us to mortify our lusts, and to use our understandings; nevertheless says Paul, 'in malice or wickedness be ye *children*, BUT IN UNDERSTANDING BE YE MEN.*' The priests cannot understand this; they translate it,—in understanding be ye children, and by this they mean childishness! 'The scrupulous,' says Dr. Newman's St. Philip, 'should remit them *always and in everything to the judgment of their confessors, and accustom themselves to have a contempt for their scruples.*' (May 11.) St. Paul says, 'whatsoever is not of faith, is sin; let every one be fully persuaded,' and respect his scruples, which St. Philip says we are to despise. 'Neither must we,' says the sainted Philip, 'give ourselves *so much to mortify the flesh as to MORTIFY THE BRAIN, WHICH IS THE CHIEF THING after all.*' (Aug. 22.) So the one thing needful for a Romanist is to clear out his brain pan, and make room for Romanism, by having first an empty head: so writes the saint whose picture hangs over Dr. Newman's head. Whether the Doctor has taken the advice, is for him to say; but he assures us, that only a Catholic can understand Catholicism, in other words, we must lose our understanding before we can understand it. Such are the '*Logical consistencies of the Romanist's view.*' St. Philip says, 'THE SANCTITY OF A MAN LIES in the breadth of three fingers (the forehead,) that is to say, IN MORTIFYING THE UNDERSTANDING, *which would fain reason upon things.*' (Nov. 5.) And this he says, in his meditation for *the fifth of November*, gun-powder plot day. This is a more horrible plot, to blow up man's reason, or in the physical language of the saint, to mortify man's brains by blowing them out! What a dear, good saint; how well he mortified his understanding. The great means of this mortification is implicit faith in our confessor, and this is a grand proof of the state of that 'three-fingered' region.

"'When we go to confession,' observes our patron, 'we ought to *persuade ourselves* TO FIND JESUS CHRIST IN OUR CONFESSOR.' (Dec. 2) and see the blessedness of this blasphemous persuasion, whoever is directed by his spiritual superiors, as our 'most dear son' in Satan, the Bartholomew butcher,—'he,' says the patron of lies, the patron of the Oratorians, 'he who always acts in obedience [*i. e.* to spiritual superiors] MAY REST ASSURED THAT HE WILL NOT HAVE TO GIVE AN ACCOUNT OF HIS ACTIONS TO GOD.' (Feb. 4.)

* 1 Cor. xiv. 20.

“May he rest assured of this,—then Paul is a liar, for saying that we must ALL stand before the judgment seat of Christ, to give an account of EVERY DEED *done in the body, whether it be good or bad.* Is not this a magnificent instrument of tyranny, the very secret of persecution, that our spiritual advisers can thus take our sins upon themselves, and not even absolve us, but what is more infamous, ungodly and diabolical, *remove our responsibility?* But what does the Scripture say to victims of such shameless deceivers of the nations? ‘Be not deceived, God is not mocked; *for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap.*’”

“What then shall this founder of the Oratory reap, who sowed lies? What is the true divine answer to this glozing sophistry of these Oratorians, in their opposition to our private judgment and their denial of the judgment of God,—two Roman heresies which go together, denying man’s liberty and God’s exclusive prerogative? There is but one answer, —‘*So then EVERY one of us shall GIVE ACCOUNT OF HIMSELF to God.*’ —(Rom. xiv. 12.) May we have Christ now, as our “only hope,” and then we shall rejoice at his appearing to judge the world by his word.

“Thus far we see how Dr. Newman would free Protestantism from the logical inconsistency of persecution, that we may join THAT PARTY IN WHICH IT IS LOGICALLY CONSISTENT.

“And if, as his whole argument implies, persecution be an inconsistency with us, but a consistency with him, it follows, that persecution is a logical element of his religion, which religion (according to Philip, the founder of the Roman sect of the Oratory) has no logic in it, but requires the absence of brains or a mortified understanding, as the road to perfection in virtue; instead of the road to Bedlam. If Dr. Newman and his brethren be logically consistent with their founder, they should baptize the new Oratory, ‘the New Asylum.’ And if we need further proof of the lamentable mental condition of the founder of the Oratorian heresy, we need quote only one other passage, pointed out by a friend who kindly provided us with ‘Philip’s Maxims and Sayings.’ It is the reflection, meditation, or spiritual food set down for the 4th of October; and the reader is directed in the preface, to read only one a day: it is called a repast. Now here is splendid entertainment: ‘*we ought to desire to be in such a condition, as to want siapence, and not be able to get it.*’

“Brothers of the Oratory, here is a ‘philosophical difficulty,’ to explain on what principle a man *ought* to be such an arrant booby? This St. Philip is your great light; but the light that was in him was darkness, and you rejoice in that darkness.”

Need more be said, to convict St. Philip, and through him, the Roman Church, which sanctions his teachings, canonizes himself, and harbours his followers—to convict St. Philip and the Roman Church of teaching “doctrines of devils,” denying God’s word, dethroning man’s reason, destroying man’s responsibility to God, to set up the temple of superstition, in which the priest shall fill the shrine;—“who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that as God, he sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God?” —(Thess. ii. 4.)

* Galatians vi. 7.

III.

STATESMEN'S RELIGION.

"EVERY PLANT WHICH MY HEAVENLY FATHER HATH NOT PLANTED, SHALL BE ROOTED UP."—(Matt. xv. 13.)

In those who think a National Church right, Dissent is a sin; in those who think it wrong, silence is a shame.

THE REV. I. E. N. MOLESWORTH, D.D. AND HIS WESLEYAN CONVERT.

A LITTLE Pamphlet with the following pithy title, "Go to Church—by W. G. formerly a Wesleyan," may amuse if not astonish our readers; it would be quite safe to print it without note or comment, though it is "published at the request of I. E. N. Molesworth, D.D., Vicar of Rochdale."

The Author gives a very interesting autobiography in his "preface:—the sentiments contained in this Tract are those of one who had been brought up in the Wesleyan connexion. On arriving at years of maturity, he was enabled, by earnest prayer and a diligent study of the subject, to throw aside the *prejudices* of early instruction, to adopt the principles and services of the Church of England, and to seek admission into its communion, from a firm and decided conviction that the English Church is *the* true Apostolic branch of the Church of Christ in this country; that its teaching is the pure Christianity of the Bible; that in principle and practice, it approaches more nearly to the primitive Church than any other; and that, consequently, its claim to be received as a correct standard of faith is superior to that of any other system.

W. G."

This preface may teach our Church friends to exclaim, "save us from our friends;" for the tone is an Oxford *intonation*; and the finger-post points to Rome.

The reasons why we should "go to church," are very discriminating and emphatic; they are marked off by numerals, and begin with '*Because*':—thus, "go to church,"

"I. *Because* in the authorized principles of the Church we meet with nothing but purely orthodox and evangelical Truth. The doctrines of the Holy Trinity; the natural sinfulness of man; the atonement of Christ; the influence of the Holy Spirit; justification by faith; the Sacraments, as means of grace; the necessity of good works, with the happiness of the righteous after death, and the eternal destruction of the finally im-

penitent, are some of the leading principles the Church has derived from God's word."

Do the Wesleyans deny the Trinity and atonement? Then why not stop with them?

"II. *Because* of the suitableness and completeness, the Scriptural and devotional character of its Liturgy. In spirituality and tendency to assist the devotions, and promote the edification of the worshipper, it may fairly challenge a comparison with every other uninspired production. And in no other religious service whatever is so large a portion of the sacred Scriptures read. On some occasions *nine* chapters of the Bible are repeated during one service."

It is a pity W. G.'s Wesleyan friends did not know about the Bible, or perhaps they also would have read it in their chapels. But we are to "go to church" again,

"III. *Because* it is the only Protestant system which provides *efficiently* for *public* worship; that is, for the worship of God, in which the *whole* congregation is required *publicly* to join. In other systems, the minister *alone* worships publicly, and therefore sustains the part of a theatrical performer, rather than any thing else. Whereas, in the Church, provision is made for *all* to *unite* in prayer and praise."

By worshipping, our pamphleteer seems to mean *speaking out*; some Methodists do this.

"IV. *Because* of the Scriptural character of its mode of Church government, which is *Episcopacy*. No one can read the New Testament attentively, especially the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, without perceiving that the Episcopal form was sanctioned and adopted in primitive times by the Apostles themselves."

This is not doubted; but *what* is a bishop? Independency, is Episcopacy.

"V. *Because* its ministers possess authority to dispense the word of God, and to administer the sacraments, derived in a direct line through the Apostles, from Christ himself, who alone has absolute authority in the Church; and who has given commission to his Apostles, and through them to their successors alone to the end of time, to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation to every creature under heaven."

When did Christ give them this authority, and take it from others?

"VI. *Because*, in separating from the Church, you render yourself guilty of the sin St. Paul refers to, when he requires "that there shall be no schism in the body.* By *schism* is meant the separation of one or more members of the Church from the rest, to form a distinct sect or party by themselves. [!] And if separatists repudiate this appellation, on the ground that it refers to division in the Church, not to separation from it, I answer, that those who make a division in the universal Church are *schismatics*,—those who separate from it are *apostates*. Under one or other of these denominations, those who separate must be classed."

[Unfortunately, *no one* can separate from the universal Church, so we are safe.]

"Most of the differences now unhappily existing in the Establishment have arisen from the disposition manifested by some to sympathize with

* 1 Cor. xii. 12—27.

those who have separated from us—the Papists on the one hand, and the Dissenters on the other; while the Church has wisely and providentially chosen a path midway between these two extremes of error.”

Did the Papists separate from you, or you from them, and both from the Apostles?

“VII. *Because* there are no professedly Christian communities in a state of separation from the Church in this country, which have not fallen into grievous doctrinal errors, detrimental to the growth of piety, and subversive of religious truth. Either they limit the mercy of God to a small portion of mankind, or they assign to human nature a moral and religious capability, which is not warranted by the Scriptures of truth. *Heresy* or *religious error* arises from the presumption and vain confidence of such as follow out their own preconceived notions, instead of taking an authoritative standard of truth as their guide. Now, the *Bible* ALONE is the religion of Churchmen, and God has graciously condescended to give to man this infallible rule, to direct his faith and practice. To it implicit obedience should be yielded; and no man has a right, natural or acquired, to make a religion for himself.”

Do you leave out the Prayer Book then; and do you all agree about it? Is not Gorham a heretic, a *schismatic*, or do you agree to differ, and *cherish schisms*? But we must “go to Church,”

“VIII. *Because the Church of England is the greatest bulwark against Popery in the world.* Its Articles and Homilies yield to no uninspired compositions in their firm and decided protest against the errors of Rome. The supremacy of the Sovereign is almost of itself a sufficient guarantee that the withering curse of Papal influence will never again overspread these realms.”

Who provides the swarms of new priests, but your Church, with all her homilies?

“IX. *Because* it is the established religion of the country; and it is sinful to separate from a Church established by law, *unless it can be proved from Holy Scripture that its principles are opposed to the will of God.* And this cannot be with the Church of England, which is emphatically, in reference to this country, ‘the Church of the first-born,’ and is based on the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.”

But it is proved from Scripture that a National Church is not a Christian institution.

“Nor is its connexion with the State contrary to the spirit of Christianity, or to the dictates of God’s word. On the other hand, it is evident, not only that such connexion is scripturally lawful and religiously expedient, but also that it is the duty of the State to provide for the spiritual instruction of the people, and for the performance of religious worship among them.”

Why not quote the passages?

“X. *Because*, while other religious bodies are, from their own confession, in a state of progressive declension, the Church of England is arising to a sense of its pre-eminent position in the kingdom and in the world; is reviving in Christian purity and truth: and the ministrations of the clergy are increasing in usefulness and efficiency. That most impor-

tant of all ministerial duties—pastoral visitation—which is so much neglected among others as to be almost forgotten, is revived and carried out much more extensively in the Establishment.”

No doubt the Church is beginning to find out her position; and we hope she will soon rectify it.

Having briefly enumerated some of the reasons for the advice given, each of which would require a large treatise fully to discuss, permit me to add—*Go then to Church.* Attend the house of God regularly and constantly. Whenever that sacred dwelling-place of the Most High is open for divine worship, let your presence there be an example to others, and a source of spiritual advancement to yourself. And let your voice be heard during the service, in singing the praises of your Maker; and in the responses, acknowledging his mercies, imploring the forgiveness of your sins, and the assistance of God's Holy Spirit to enable you henceforth to walk in newness of life. Let the spirit of the Psalmist constantly animate you: ‘One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life; to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to enquire in his TEMPLE.’* There God has declared he delights to record his name, and to his faithful worshippers will impart all the blessings of his salvation, ‘ever world without end.’”

W. G.

W. G. has evidently been all along thinging of the “Temple of *Jerusalem*, not one stone of which is now left upon another, but all is overturned: may his newly adopted Church take warning in time; that as the Jewish temple was overthrown, to make way for a spiritual Israel; so the Episcopalian body, may purify itself, and become a Church of true spiritual worshippers and no longer an amalgamation of the world and the Church; the “form of godliness” as a national cloak, without “the power thereof.”

We are sorry for Dr. Molesworth, that he can find nothing better to recommend.

• Ps. xxvii. 4.

IV.

SCEPTICS' RELIGION.

Under this department, sceptical objections, and systems or principles advocated as hostile to Christianity, are dispassionately considered.

THE REV. ROBERT NARES, A.M., ON THE CHARACTER OF CHRIST.

As the best and safest refutation of objections, is the exhibition of the truth, we propose here to conclude our reply to the mistaken objections against Christianity, contained in the "Autobiography of an Atheist," by a few considerations on the real nature of Christianity, as exhibited in the life of Christ himself. Whilst our own views on this subject,—the real nature of the gospel, are presented in various forms under the first department, we here avail ourselves of the excellent suggestions contained in the introductory part of a work entitled—

"The Veracity of the Evangelists Demonstrated; by a comparative view of their histories."*

If our extracts serve no other purpose than to call attention to this admirable manual of spiritual criticism and moral argument, it will do great good. We commend the work especially to students and teachers of the word of life.

"To write a life of Christ cannot be necessary. Several of acknowledged excellence already exist; they are in the hands of the pious in general; and they must all be drawn from the same divine source, the gospels. But it has appeared to me that some general reflections, of considerable importance, may still be made upon those sacred histories; tending to throw light upon the whole, and upon particular parts. To these reflections therefore I hasten, without fatiguing the reader with the form of a regular exordium. For considerations on this subject, the religious will no more require an apology, than the impious and the thoughtless will admit of any.

"The more we reflect upon the gospel history, taken altogether, in its various features and peculiarities, the more firmly we must feel convinced that it cannot possibly be the history of a mere man; nor can have been produced by the common powers of human nature. The principal character, Jesus Christ, is a personage who has no prototype or resemblance in the history of the world.† He could not possibly have any; for a

* By the Rev. Robert Nares, A.M. C. F. Rivington, St. Paul's Church-yard.

† The Editors of the British Critic say (October, 1816, p. 392) that the creations of

man without a fault was never seen, and he had none. If there had been faults in his character, an honest historian would have recorded them, as Moses told his own; and the Evangelists those of themselves, and their brethren, even when most disgraceful to them. But they could not entirely have concealed the faults of their Master, even with the utmost desire to do it, had there been any in his character. They would have been traced in the circumstances of the narrative; they would have been elicited from the facts themselves, however studiously suppressed or palliated by the historians. Ambition, for instance, would have appeared in his conduct; or pride; or the love of worldly glory; or cruelty, or violence of temper. Whatever, in short, marks the character of a public man, through his public actions, could not wholly have been hidden: and if some more secret vices had been studiously suppressed, the virulence of those adversaries, who made crimes even of his miracles, and prophetic speeches, could not have failed to trace them out, and to urge them strongly against them.

"But he was without fault: and this is the more certain, because his proper historians have never directly said it. They have written the most simple of all narratives. They have not even attempted to draw his character, or to venture an opinion of their own upon it.

"They have apologized for nothing; they have merely told what their Master said and did, on such occasions as they thought proper to record; and have left their readers to discern his character in the facts. They have acted most wisely in so doing. They have thus avoided everything that could give a suspicious appearance to their history; all partizanship; all pleading of a cause. But observe, that this very thing is what was never done by any other historians in the world. It is then at least a reason for distinguishing the Evangelists from all other writers: * and this is no small matter.

But the history of a man without a fault, or even the suspicion of an infirmity, is as remote from the experience of mankind, as any thing that is most miraculous. Of those who have been celebrated for any famous acts or works, the general history has been, that some great qualities have been counter-balanced by faults equally great; or by infirmities which make us blush for our common nature. It would be an irksome enquiry to pursue, but the exceptions to this assertion could not be numerous, nor probably any; except such as arose from the imperfection of our accounts. The examples, on the other hand, are many, striking, and well known.

CHAP. I.—"THE CHARACTER OF JESUS CHRIST COULD NOT HAVE BEEN INVENTED.

Shakespeare have no prototype in nature. This is a mistake, for they have all their foundation in the human character. Titania is a jealous and capricious wife; Caliban a gross and brutal wretch, but who might be a man, if the poet had not chosen to feign otherwise. But besides, the merit of Shakespeare's supernatural fictions is, that they fall in with the general ideas of men, applied to such subjects. Every one feels that they have a kind of truth, though feigned. But the character of Jesus contradicts every common or previous idea of men, concerning the probable demeanour of so exalted a human being.

* We may except perhaps some other sacred writers; but that rather corroborates than weakens the pretensions of these.

"But I proceed further, and say, with the utmost conviction of the truth of the assertion, that, supposing the most ardent desire to impose upon the world the picture of a man without a fault, such a character as that of Jesus Christ, could not have been drawn from fancy or invention by any person or persons who ever lived in this world, before that character had actually appeared. The reason for this is so plain and certain, that I cannot conceive it to admit even of a cavil. It is simply this: that the ideas or principles, upon which that character is formed, did not then exist in the world. Humility, meekness, forgiveness of injuries, universal benevolence were not, anywhere, at that time, esteemed as virtues, or as exalted features of character. No man whoever lived, in any country of the world, would have proposed patience under insults, as a part of an illustrious-character; or would have thought of uniting mild forbearance with powers superior to human nature, and an origin derived from heaven. Dignity of character indeed we see in the evangelical picture of our Saviour, the simplest yet sublimest dignity; but it is a dignity totally unmixed with pride; consequently it was a species of dignity never before seen on earth. It was a species of dignity which could not possibly have been conceived, since it arose from circumstances, in which a mere man could not possibly have stood; from an inherent and intrinsic elevation, depending neither upon the accidents of life, nor the opinions of men; but upon something extraneous, even to human nature itself.

"Such a character could not, I say, have been imagined, for the circumstances which produced it were wholly inconceivable. The people of Israel, though they expected their Messiah at that time, expected only a mortal, a descendant of David: or if some among them, from those various prophecies, which certainly intimate a higher character, had expected God incarnate,* how was the imagination of man to form such a union for itself? Few persons, I believe, will venture to deny, that if they *had* imagined such a personage, they would have figured to themselves a very different being from the mild and humble Jesus; born in a low situation of life, though of the predicted royal origin; living obscurely for the greater part of his time; and, even in the period of his public celebrity, without a regular home, or any ostensible means of daily support.

"The Jews, more especially, could not have had such a conception; since it is demonstrable that their ideas ran wholly upon power, and splendour, and conquest; deliverance from the Roman yoke; and indeed, no less than universal dominion over other nations. A Messiah, formed by Jewish imaginations, would undoubtedly have been a mighty general, a conqueror and a king. On whose arms, if not sufficiently potent by human strength, would have been seconded by miraculous agency. Their ideas would infallibly have recurred to the sword of God and of Gideon, or the irresistible progress of Joshua; except that they would have extended their hero's victories upon a more magnificent scale, making the whole world their theatre, instead of the confined and inconsiderable territory of Canaan. The indications of this disposition may be traced even in the chosen twelve; but most remarkably when, after the resurrection

* "The Lord himself shall suddenly come to his temple."—Mal. iii. 1.

of Jesus, they presumed to ask him, ' Lord, wilt thou, at this time, restore again the kingdom of Israel ?'*

" But I say, yet more generally, that neither the Jews, *nor any other human beings*, could possibly have had a conception of such a personage and such a character as Jesus Christ, as he appears throughout the several gospels; nor could they have drawn or collected it, except from the reality presented to their observation. The illustration of this important truth, in various points of view, will form the chief subject of these remarks; which, if they convey to any other minds the conviction impressed by them upon that of the Author, cannot fail to be of considerable use."

* Acts i. 6.

V.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN NATURE.

The Nature of Man as Spiritual, Immortal, and Responsible, will be the most frequent topic of this department: though sometimes we shall introduce MISCELLANEOUS Subjects.

MIND AND MATTER: THEIR EVIDENCES AND DISTINCTIONS.

(Continued from page 431.)

I SHALL take notice but of one thing more, and that is,* Mr. Gildon's attempt to prove the materiality of the soul; his arguments are as unlikely to prove it, as most I have seen: but I shall shew the notion to be absurd in itself, and impossible to be maintained.

The essence of all matter must be the same, whether extension, or any thing else, be assigned as the essence of it; and though we may be ignorant of the essence of matter, yet we know it cannot be essential to it to think: for then all matter would necessarily think. But the difference in the several sorts of matter can be only in accidents, that is, in bulk, rest, motion, situation, and figure, none of which can render matter capable of thought. For if a different bulk of matter could produce thought in it, and the subtile matter should be able to think and reason, though the gross cannot; then the parts of a stone would think, when it is ground to dust; though when they are joined and compacted together, they make up a body, as unlikely to think, as any thing we can imagine. If *rest* could cause matter to think, a stone would be the most thinking creature in the world. If *motion* could cause it, than that which moves with most quickness, would think most, as fire, and the sun, and stars: but motion is only a successive change of place, and there is no reason why matter should think in one place, rather than in another; or why it should think, when it is moved in a right line, or in a circle, or in any curve line, rather than when it lies still. Again, there is no reason why matter should be able to think, or not think, according to its *situation* or *position*; why it should think in the brain, rather than upon the trencher; or when it is digested, and reduced to animal spirits, rather than when it is in a more compacted substance, and has a different relation to the parts of matter about it. Lastly, if any sort of *figure* could produce thought, stones must certainly think, as well as the best of us; and so, indeed, might anything else: for what body is there that they may not subsist under all varieties of figure?

Oracles of Reason, p. 187.

Neither can any lucky conjuncture of all these together produce a power and faculty of thinking. For, imagine what bulk, rest or motion, situation and figure you can, to meet together, they are all alike incapable of so much as one thought; since there is nothing in the nature of any of these accidents or modifications of matter, but it is as far from any power of thinking, as matter itself is; and therefore thinking can no more arise from a combination of them together, than it can proceed from the amassing together of matter. All the accidents, but motion, have nothing active or operative in them, but are only matter under different modes and relations. And motion, whatever the figure, or bulk and contexture of any body may be, can be but motion still; and suppose what contexture or modifications you will; what is motion, under all determinations, collisions and combinations, but change of place? And, how can change of place produce thinking, under any variety of contexture in the particles of matter? Free-will is impossible to be accounted for by matter or motion, as *Epicurus* found, who was therefore forced to have recourse to his *declinationes atomorum*; for which he is so justly exposed by *Tully*. For neither can matter determine its own motion, nor can motion determine itself, but must be determined by something external; whereas all men find it in their power to determine themselves by an inward and voluntary principle.

It is true, indeed, that the soul, in its operations, depends very much upon the temperament of the body: yet the soul, even in this state, has thoughts, which have no relation to the body, or any material thing; as thoughts of God and spirits, its own reflex thoughts, or consciousness of its own operations. And if it were now capable of no thoughts, but such as have some dependence upon the body; yet this can never prove that the soul itself is material, or that matter thinks. A man writes with his pen, and cannot write without one; is it therefore his pen properly that writes, and not the man? The body is the instrument of the soul, in its operations here; and as the instrument is fit or unfit, so much its operations be more or less perfect.

But it is strange, that the chief part of us should be of such a nature, that we can form no idea of it. We may form an idea of it, though but an imperfect one: and do we not know, that the eye, the noblest part of the body, cannot see itself, but imperfectly, and by reflection? And let any man try, whether he can form a better idea of a material soul, than of an immaterial one. But this writer, by *idea* seems to mean a material *idea*, or imagination; and we cannot, indeed, form a material *idea* of an immaterial spirit. Yet, after all which he, or any man else, has said, the nature of the soul is as clearly understood, as that of the body: and there is nothing encumbered with greater difficulties than extension, if that be the essence of matter; and if that be not, it is as hard still to know what the essence of matter is. The instance which he brings of brutes, is easily answered, whether they can think, or not. If they cannot, the objection falls of itself: if they can, I should rather suppose, that their souls may be annihilated, or may transmigrate and pass from one brute to another, than that the souls of men must be material, that the souls of brutes may be material too.

Another gentleman, of late, has asserted,* that it is impossible for us, by the contemplation of our own ideas, without revelation, to discover whether omnipotency hath not given to some systems of matter, fitly disposed, a power to perceive or think; and that there is a possibility that God may, if he pleases, super-add to matter a faculty of thinking; which is what he likewise calls a modification of thinking, or power of thinking. But it seems not intelligible, how God should super-add to matter this faculty, or power, or modification of thinking, unless he change the nature of matter, and make it to be quite another thing than it is, or join a substance of another nature to it. But the question is whether a faculty of thinking can be produced out of the powers and various modifications of matter? And we can have no more conception, how any modification of matter can produce thinking, than we can, how any modification of sound should produce seeing: all modifications of matter are the same, as to this point; and matter may as well be made no matter by modifying, as be made to think by it. This is just as if a man should maintain, that though all immaterial substances are not extended and divisible, yet some of them may possibly be, or omnipotence may super-add to them a faculty of extension and divisibility: for immaterial substances may become divisible and material by the same philosophy, by which we may conclude, that matter may think; which is the same thing as to become immaterial, and to surpass all the powers and capacities of matter. He† urges, that there may be capacities in matter, which no man can conceive, since that gravitating power, which Sir Isaac Newton has proved to belong to all bodies, would before have been thought incredible. But there is nothing in this power above the nature of matter, any more than there is in motion. For gravitation is only a determinate mode of motion: and it is very easy to conceive, that matter is as well capable of one determination of motion, as of another; since matter is herein only passive, and not active, or enabled to move voluntarily, and determine itself, as human souls do. That which is capable of any one determination of motion, may be capable of all kinds of determination; but that which may be determined always, may not be capable of determining itself any one way. Matter must ever remain incapable of thinking, unless it could change its nature, and become immaterial, and then it would not be matter, which would think, but something else. And it is of little use or consequence to enquire, what omnipotence can do by a *super-addition* of faculties to matter; when between those, who prove the soul to be immaterial, and such as suppose it to be material, the only question in dispute is, not what a divine power can effect, (for these men are unwilling to grant any such power presiding over matter) but whether a faculty of thinking can be produced out of matter, by any modifications, or changes and determinations of motion.

[We intend occasionally presenting our readers, with such parts of certain authors as may be buried amongst by-gone questions, composing the greater part of their works; and also to introduce to their

* Mr. Lock's "Humane Understanding," 1. 4. c. 3. §. 6. Letter to the Bishop of Worcester, p. 66.

† Reply to the Bishop of Worcester's Answer to his Second Letter, p. 404, &c.

notice, such extracts from scarce and voluminous authors, as are not likely to meet the eye of the many. The above, on Mind and Matter, is from a work entitled "the Reasonableness and Certainty of the Christian Religion." By Robert Jenkin, D.D. 1715. EDITOR.]

THE VISION.

One evening lately, I was sitting at an advanced hour in my study, revolving the pages of Dante's *Inferno*. My mind was agitated by many harassing circumstances, magnified and distorted by an overwrought imagination. Yet instead of seeking to calm this perturbation by the charm of soothing words, such as are to be found in the poems of Cowper, or Campbell, or Rogers. I felt urged by an unnatural impulse to satiate my thoughts, as it were, with what is terrible and overwhelming, by plunging into the strange horrors of that revelation of vengeance and woe. Dante describes himself as being guided by Virgil through the portals of hell, and conducted from one region of punishment to another, each region being appropriated to some particular crime, which is there visited with its own peculiar sufferings. As my eye passed along the lines, I accompanied them in thought through each gradation of guilt and misery, and carried away by the vivid delineations of torment, seemed almost to watch with them the writhing of the victims, and to hear the low sounds of despair in which they told of the various steps by which their sin had been consummated. Then I turned to the portrait of him who had conceived the whole, and gazing on the deep furrows of his careworn countenance, and the marks of stern grief which long and unmerited exile had stamped upon his brow, I mused upon what is probably his own fate now, in the invisible world to which he has departed. "Is he now," said I to myself, "an eternal inhabitant of those scenes of darkness and anguish through which he once travelled in imagination? What reason have we to suppose that he is not, if none but those who have the spirit of Christ can dwell with Christ for ever? And how many of earth's noblest minds bear him company in those dreary abodes! Surely all the might, majesty, genius, and beauty of earth, have gone down to the pit of perdition, and hell hath grown rich on the spoils of our ruined world. Were the rolls of fame rehearsed, and each name recorded therein responded to by him that bore it, to how many would an answer be returned by voices from beneath! My heart shuddered—I paused, and looked up. With a start, I perceived a stranger seated upon the edge of the bed, motionless, with his eyes fixed upon me with a mournful expression. He was dressed in a long dark gown that fitted close to his tall and emaciated form, the outlines of his hollow cheeks were marked by what seemed to be the dried-up channels of long-forgotten tears; a withered chaplet was twined round his ample forehead. "Who art thou?" I exclaimed with difficulty. "I, student, am the Florentine exile, Dante Alighieri, once the visitor, now the denizen of no imaginary hell: rise, and follow me." He laid his hand upon my wrist—its touch was heavy and cold; I stood up as one bewildered, who moves without will or thought. His grasp grew firmer, and locked my

arm like a manacle—"Come on," he whispered, and I followed, unresisting. We went down step after step, silently and swiftly, but there seemed no end to the descent. The passage, which had at first seemed only the breadth of the staircase, continually widened and widened, till there seemed no wall or partition on either side, as far as could be perceived by the dull and uncertain light which pervaded the air; and whereas it had at first been solitary, and we had passed on alone, I began to have an indistinct perception of numerous forms that were hurrying some upwards, some downwards, but all in silence. Not a voice was heard, not a footstep sounded. How long the descent continued I cannot tell, for I became quite unconscious of the lapse of time. At length our feet rested on what seemed a level plain, rough and uneven to the tread, as if we had been passing over rocks mingled with heaps of cinders; which however offered no obstacle to the rapid progress of my companion, nor did I myself seem to feel any difficulty in keeping up with his pace. A faint and lurid glow appeared to be breaking upon the obscurity from a distance, and a rushing sound, like that of a vast torrent, invaded the stillness which had been hitherto so deep and unbroken. It was not long before I beheld, with horror and astonishment, extending as far as the eye could reach, a sheet of wreathing smoke and flame, towering with huge spiral columns high in the air, yet not unbroken and stationary, but ever and anon in different parts subsiding, and blazing up again with renewed fury and a deafening roar, as if roused by the blast of an incessant hurricane.

My companion stopped—"Behold the walls of the eternal prison," he said. I shrunk back in dismay, my hair stood on end, my brain whirled dizzily, and I pressed the hand, that was left free, upon my eyes. "Look up, mortal," cried my guide, "we have passed the gates, and entered the realms of Justice." I looked, and saw that we had indeed, in some mysterious manner, been transported beyond the wall of fire, which rose in terrific splendour behind us, and illumined everything around with a strange unearthly gleam. We were passing along a wide valley, crowded with figures that resembled in their dress and aspect ancient statues: they moved to and fro, sorrowful and perplexed, in silence, with their eyes fixed upon the ground, as if searching for what they could not find. "These," said Dante, are the Gentile philosophers and poets, who when they knew God, glorified him not as God, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. To those imaginations they are now wholly surrendered, and that darkness has settled down upon their hearts for ever. "But let us pass forward—it was not these you came to see." I followed, unable to question or reply. Our progress was as rapid as before, so that, for a considerable time, I caught only an imperfect glance of crowds of objects that seem to hurry by us. Some that were nearer our view, my conductor pointed out, and described. "See that anchorite, he said, kneeling upon a mountebank's stage, practising his self-mortification, going through his devotions and telling his beads with incessant toil; while the surrounding multitude, whom he deceived by a pretended sanctity all his life, yell out cries of derision and scorn, that ring for ever in his ears, and cover him with perpetual confusion. Hath he not his due reward?"

Observe the tyrant, who sweats there at the forge, endeavouring to link into chains those fiery serpents that coil around and sting him, as he plies his fruitless task. But onward, onward, this is all as nothing to what you have come to see." His cold hand grasped me more firmly, and we pressed on with unabated speed. I looked on either side, and horrors were poured into my heart as into a cup, until it ran over with excess of agony. I saw a battle field on which armies were met for mortal conflict, the eyes of the combatants gleamed with undying hatred, their steeds were like evil spirits in fierceness and strength as they pawed the soil with terrific snortings; the thunders of hell sounded to the charge and they rushed to the onset, and grappled and fought, and trampled and tore each other: then they separated, and again renewed the struggle with additional fury through an eternity of vain and interminable slaughter.

And I saw revellers met round a banqueting board, which was amply spread with delicious meats and enticing wines: they gorged themselves to repletion with dainties for which they had no longer taste or appetite, and quaffed the wine continually which scorched their brain like burning poison; while they shrieked out the same insipid and miserable songs that had been the expression of their earthly happiness. I saw among them forms that I recognized. Methought it sounded strangely to hear the roof of hell re-echo the burden of "Life, let us Cherish" and "Away with melancholy." But Dante turned round, and said in stern sarcastic tone, "Is not the Deity just? have not all these the pleasures in which they delighted, even such as they thought were fitted to satisfy their immortal souls? But onward, neither was it this you came to see." I saw gamblers doomed to throw the dice in perpetual desire, frenzy and despair: I saw the votaries of fashion whirling in an endless dance, with the smile of courtesy on their cheeks, while their hearts were gnawed by everlasting envy and disdain: and one most strange spectacle I beheld, a wretched suicide, sharpening with unwearied earnestness the weapon of destruction, and driving it to his heart again and again to see if it would let out life, and release him from his agony, but in vain! and he tried the edge, and deeming it not sharp enough, whetted it again for renewed disappointment.

We halted at last. "Look around now, and gaze your fill, said the stern Florentine, for this is what you came to see. Here dwell the professors of a pure Christianity, who knew their master's will right well, but did it not." So I looked, and saw an old man, on whose knees rested a book, in which he read with close attention and intense eagerness; and as he read, he groaned as if his heart would have burst in twain, but it was riveted beyond the power of anguish to rend it. The book he read was the word of God—he had read it on earth morning and evening, he had quoted it and applied it to the admiration of all, but he had never felt its power till now.—Again I looked, and I saw a congregation assembled before a pulpit of elegant structure, and they sang the praises of God with voices loud and clear, and the melody of the lip was sweetly tuned, but the heart was ground with eternal remorse. The hymn ceased, and a preacher ascended the pulpit. His form was tall and graceful and his bearing was dignified: and as he waved his hand and commenced a discourse of splendid diction and consummate oratory, descanting upon the

glories of Christ's redemption, who would have thought that the undying worm was piercing his soul within? "There, said Dante, is an admired and popular preacher,—a finished pulpit orator,—a man who loved the pulpit as a stage for display, who considered the glories of Christ as an unequalled theme for declamation, and this cross as affording the very climax of tragic effect. Such as the Shepherd was, such were the sheep, and here they may enjoy their favorite excitement for ever. Is not this a sight far worse than that of the tyrant, or even of the suicide? But look again on the other side." I turned in speechless horror, and saw a table spread with a fair white cloth, and bread and wine were placed upon it in seemly order, and men with pale countenances sat round the board in silence, from whose eyes anguish looked forth as from the bars of a prison window. "Understandest thou," said my guide, "is not that more awful than the field of eternal carnage." I replied not, but staggered and became blind with fear. When I recovered my sight, we had turned away, and I saw at a distance a solitary pair moving along in the lurid light, a youth and a maiden, the face of the former concealed by his left hand which was pressed upon it as in a paroxysm of indescribable pain, while he held his other arm at full length as if to hold off the lady who clung to it vehemently and would not leave him. Her attire was rich, her form delicate and graceful, her eye like that of a basilisk, gleaming from under her bold and expressive forehead, which was well relieved by her dark braided hair. She opened her lips and poured forth a tide of song, like the charm of an enchantress; but as she sang, the youth's frame writhed with more violent agony. I turned with a curious and enquiring look to my conductor, who said "would you know who these are? consider them well. That youth was one of no mean attainments, of a mind ardent and strong—he knew the gospel of Christ, and entered the ministry with warm zeal and high expectations of usefulness. There is his rich, graceful, and accomplished eye amiable! but *godless* wife; and these are the songs with which she seduced his heart from Christ."

I gazed at them again with grief and pity. They came towards us. The full swell of her voice rose upon my ear so sweet and thrilling, that in myself I hardly wondered that he had been overcome. It seemed to pierce him to the soul. He threw himself down on the ground and writhed in torture. She knelt down and bent over him with an expression of such grief, and at the same time such faithfulness of affection, while her song changed to a low and plaintive air, that my heart, which had hitherto been seared and hard, touched by the scene and the melody combined, became soft like that of a child, and I burst into tears. "He weeps," cried a hundred voices, "he is not one of us—who hath ever seen tears in hell?" And at this cry came rushing towards me myriads of forms from every direction, so that, terrified, I started—and behold, the whole scene was gone, vanished entirely, and I found myself lying on the floor of my study, while the moonlight streamed into the room, and looking out I saw once more the houses and trees, and the stars twinkling in the sky above. Then I drew my breath, and wiped the cold sweat from my throbbing brow; and after long musing, I arose sad and depressed, and was sick at heart for many days, for I knew in myself that it was not all a dream, and that those forms were not mere phantoms without a real evidence anywhere.

LABOUR AND CAPITAL, OR MEN AND MASTERS; THEIR RIGHTS AND DUTIES.

SHEWING THE NECESSITY OF POPULAR EDUCATION, AND "SHORT
HOURS" OF LABOUR AS CONTRIBUTING THERETO.

Money is not the capitalist's chief good.
Labour is not the workman's chief end.

THE great contest now going on in the world is between private selfishness and universal right; between personal interests and party prejudices, on the one hand; and the general good of mankind on the other. The great theorem that is being demonstrated is, that direct selfishness is shortsighted; and that men best secure their own good by forgetting themselves, and caring for others. This controversy has been maintained a long time in secret; but now, by the advance of intelligence, is becoming more public, and every successful enterprise is in the right direction: as seen in the increasing freedom of thought, in the emancipation of the slave, in the attempts to *emancipate freemen* from the excessive domination of labour, and from the thralldom of ignorance: the one aiming at the shackles of the body; the other at the shackles of the mind. We propose examining these subjects in their connection with each other.

There have been various efforts made of late by different associations, to alleviate the labours of shopmen, *i. e.* of those who serve behind the counters; but it seems to be too much forgotten that the same arguments tell in favour of a larger class of persons, and with a greater force; for besides that the greater number is the more important, the majority of this greater number are also more severely tasked; and therefore have greater need of relaxation. But our object is not to exalt the claims of one class to the detriment of another: this is always both foolish and injurious. Society is like the human body; if one class suffers, the others must sympathize: if one is ill-used, the evil will re-act upon the rest. "If one member suffers, all the members suffer with it." Only in society the misfortune is, that the consequences are not so readily seen. The landholder may impose restrictions on commerce, in order to favour agriculture, and for a time—within a very narrow limit—the end may appear to be gained; but the real effect will eventually be seen, namely, that by *injuring one, you injure all*;—that agriculture cannot thrive on the ruins of commerce, but must be ruined itself at the same time; for agriculture forms a commodity of the market, and must consequently be influenced by the exchangeable value of other things. But if the interest of the farmer and the merchant cannot really be separated, the same thing is more obviously true of the interest of the employer and the employed. It is a great mistake in either party to think that, in the long run, it can be benefited by injuring the other. Their interests are one. We have, therefore no party quarrel, for or against either; but have to beg the at-

tention of both to a subject of mutual interest, namely, the evils of various kinds: first, to the workpeople themselves, and eventually, as a matter of course, to all other classes resulting from a too extended time of labour.

It seems generally imagined that no other sort of reasoning is of value on this question but such as refers to health; in other words, the sound condition of the body, *as if this constituted the whole of a man*; so that the inquiry has amounted to a problem of this sort,—how much labour, and for how long a time can these bodies endure? Now, we think that this is a grossly ignorant way of handling the question; for, after all that can be said, it is the lowest ground that can be taken. If men could endure an unlimited amount of labour, still they have higher ends to answer than mere labour; and though they possessed iron sinews, and lungs of brass, it would not follow that they are merely machines made for drudgery.

To argue this point chiefly on the score of health, is to take it for granted that man is a “beast of burden,” whose task is to be measured by his power of endurance. But both employers and employed will reject such a notion with disgust: man is a nobler creature than a camel of the desert, or a carrier’s horse. Now, even these animals must not be overwrought, or they become permanently injured; they must be kept in good condition, properly fed and managed, or the avaricious driver outwits himself by running his useful servants. Nay, more, a steam-engine or any other piece of dead machinery, must be kept in good order—properly oiled or greased, otherwise it will wear out too soon.

Let us try to suppose a case. Here, say, is a large factory; huge machines are whirling round in mimic omnipotence, and a few feeble men by the advantage of intelligence are regulating the whole: if, then, some being (not belonging to this world, and not knowing what men are,) should enter such a factory, and look around, he might at first consider men *as only a part of the factory*,—mere machines moving about and doing their part of the work on the same principle as the rest; he would perceive no difference. But at night, when the whole stopped, he would notice that whilst the straps, rollers, and wheels remain within the walls; that curious bundle of machinery called man moved out of the place and came back in the morning. Here, then, would appear a difference. “Do those moveable engines (men) work in any other factory, or why do they go away and leave the rest behind them?” And after our inquiring visitor had learned that they went to a home to rest, he would ask, “what does HOME mean? and why is not the factory their resting place, as it is the only permanent place of the larger machines?”

He would next have to learn that these men are living, intelligent, moral creatures, who were not made simply to work, but who work that they may obtain the means of satisfying certain wants. He would learn that these men are linked to similar beings by moral ties, standing in the relation of child, parent, brother, sister, friend; and that besides these social or moral relations to each other, there is also a God above them, to whom they owe admiration, awe, gratitude, submission and love. Here, then, we say, would be a higher point of view in which to regard men; and the next inquiry would be, *should there not be some proportion in the time allotted to these various purposes?* The discovery that man is a person, not a thing—an end, not a means, throws great light on the sub-

ject: manufactures are for men, not men for manufactures; *a man is above his work,—is of more consequence than what he produces.* All work, all manufactures, commerce of whatever description, is for the good of men,—is a means of supplying their wants; and therefore men ought not to be regarded or treated as if subordinate to any of these purposes.

MAN IS THE HIGHEST PRODUCTION IN THIS WORLD; the greatest manufactory going on here is the formation of men into intellectual, moral, and religious creatures. Whatever, therefore, stands in the way of this is in direct defiance of that being who formed the world and filled it with inhabitants, placing man at the head.

Labour may be either a blessing or a curse. It is a blessing so far as it gives men some definite pursuit, forming a kind of ballast for character, steadying men's minds, training them for duty, rendering them self-helpful, and mutually useful; but labour is a curse, so far as by crushing or overtasking the powers of the body, it represses the energies of the soul; checks the growth of what is divine within us, and stands between man and that high position which his nature was intended to reach.

Every reasonable deduction, therefore, from the time given to labour, and reasonance of this time to intellectual pursuits is so far lifting off from him that yoke which belongs to beasts of burden, and placing on his head that mark of sovereignty which belongs to the Lord of creation, and which was bestowed on man by the Maker and proprietor of all. Hitherto we have been denying that man is intended merely for work, and that the right principle on which to conduct this inquiry is,—how much work can he stand without material injury to his physical frame? And if the discussion is not to be carried on in reference to the physical capabilities of man, it plainly follows that other parts of his nature are to be considered; and consequently it is implied that whatever faculties a man has should have as fair a chance of improvement as possible, and that *the preference should be given to the noblest part.* The obligation of this rule evidently arises from such a principle as this, namely, God, who made man with certain noble capacities, intended these capacities to be developed; therefore HE WHO REPRESSES THE GROWTH OF THESE SEEDS WHICH GOD HAS SOWN, commits a more flagrant violation of right than he who should by some means retard the growth of what the husbandman has sown, and should thus deprive us of a harvest. For in the former case the planter is greater, and the seeds are more precious. The only definite and unquestioned principle on which we can proceed is this,—what did the Maker of man intend him for?—in other words, what is God's will as expressed in the tendencies of human nature? If, then, the question be asked,—what is man for? let it be answered as in the case of any piece of machinery. Now, in such a case the answer would be looked for in the capability of the instrument, what it was fitted for: just so, then, with man; what is he capable of? And the answer to this may fairly be supposed to indicate the intention of his Maker; just as a watchmaker may fairly be supposed to have made a watch to tell the time by, since this is what the watch is evidently fitted for. Having thus stated, illustrated, and defended the principle on which all conduct in reference to man should be founded, we have next more specifically to follow out and apply this principle.

And here it is satisfactory to introduce an independent authority : after adopting the previous line of argument and illustration, we met with the following passage, in which the same general principle is applied to another subject; and we insert it here as confirmatory of our own method. It contains the cherished idea of a man* who loved his kind, and who sought to elevate man by the loftiest means. His general principles will be valued in proportion as his character and abilities are understood; he was a man of vast attainments, sound sense, and liberal thoughts; though dead he will yet speak to the learned by his classical and historical works; to the Christian, by his life and religious writings; and whilst he sought to unite all religious parties on liberal, though somewhat mistaken principles, he deserves the lasting gratitude of the working classes, especially by his earnest efforts to enlighten them by his own pen, and by his influence with others. Whilst, therefore, no one can regard without regret the sudden disappearance of so promising a luminary, we cannot bear higher testimony to his memory than by gaining all possible advantage from the noble thoughts and useful fragments he has left behind.

After all parties—friends and enemies—have hastened to honour him by their tribute of admiration and regret, we cannot honour him more than by employing his aid, in a cause that was dear to his heart.

“What say you,” (he writes in 1827, to Dr. Whately, the present Archbishop of Dublin,) “to a work on *politike* in the old Greek sense of the term, in which I should try to apply the principles of the gospel to the legislation and administration of a state. It would begin with a simple statement of the *telos* of man, according to Christianity, and then would go on to shew how the knowledge of this *telos* would effect all our views of national wealth; and the whole question of political economy.” The word *politike*, means “the art of government” or the science of society: *telos* means the end of man;—what he was intended for. This will at once be seen to be a corroboration of our general argument; though Dr. Arnold here applied it to a different case: it is perhaps the most vexed question of the day, as to how far, or rather in what way, whether *directly or indirectly*, the principles of Christianity should be applied to the government of a state: with this particular question however, we need not meddle here; for whatever may be the difference of opinion in this respect, the indirect influence of Christianity, in affecting the private conduct of individuals, is generally admitted. Yet should any one object even to this, it may further be perceived, that whilst Dr. Arnold takes the “chief end of man” as his ruling principle, he founds this at once on Christianity; whilst we discover this “end,” in the make or structure of human nature; as indicating the intention of the Creator: the result however is substantially the same.

We have then next to consider the various branches of this idea,—the end of man; what is he for? This we say must be answered by another question,—WHAT IS HE? Now if man were simply a curiously wrought living machine; made up of muscles and bones artistically arranged, on the nicest principles of mechanics;—adaptable to all the various purposes of commercial enterprize; it would follow that the end of man, is the same as the end or purpose of any other tool or machine: namely, to be em-

* Thomas Arnold, D.D. See his life and correspondence by A. P. Stanley, M.A.

ployed in manufacturing. But there is evidently something more in human nature; he has not only a body "wonderfully made," but a soul, in which are still greater wonders: formed to be the intelligent spectator of God's works; and to love both the Creator and his creatures.

"The great Pan of old, who was clothed in a leopard skin, to signify the beautiful variety of things, and the firmament, his coat of stars, was but the representation of thee, O rich and various man! thou palace of sight and sound; carrying in thy senses, the morning and the night, and the unfathomable galaxy; in thy brain, the geometry of the city of God; in thy heart, the bower of love, and the realms of right and wrong."* "What a piece of work is a man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! in form and moving, how express and admirable! in action, how like an angel! in apprehension, how like a God! the beauty of the world!"†

The body of man therefore, instead of being the tool of capital, is an implement given to the presiding soul; to aid in fulfilling her wishes and duties.

The various compartments of human nature,—(if we may speak so of that which is one,) may be arranged into four: first, those affections connected with the body; namely, sensations. Secondly, the intellect, including thoughts in general. Thirdly, the heart, meaning here, social affections; the ties of kindred, interest, and affection: forming the elements of society. Fourthly, the religious principle, refining all other relationships, and sanctioning all duty by the highest obligation. Such may be regarded as a rough outline of human nature; a statement of what man is,—in answer to the question,—what is he for?

We shall consider each of these separately, and the laws on which the health of each depends.

First, MAN AS POSSESSING A BODY. The same being who endowed us with this physical nature, appointed also certain physical laws, or conditions, in connexion with these bodies might exist in the most healthy condition. By a certain amount of exertion, they are wearied; and repose, is the condition by which they are refreshed: at certain times there is an exhaustion of the juices of the system; which the nutriment of food must supply; there is a certain amount and continuance of labour that over-strains the system; permanently injuring the health;—destroying the constitution. These principles are practically acknowledged even in the treatment of animals; which from mere economy are not over-worked; are well tended as to bedding down, feeding, &c.

There is also a general principle in this, as in all things, namely, *that a long continuance, wears from mere monotony or sameness*: and this principle holds more forcibly, *when there are a mind and a body together*; animals therefore may endure mere sameness of employment longer than intelligent agents; for these, being *jaded in mind* as well as body, become less spirited in work; and want refreshing by change. So that in intelligent workers, there is a double weariness, namely of body and mind: the mind increasing the weariness of the body.

To shew this,—the influence of the mind on the body—take for instance a man tired with a long journey; he becomes inspirited on sight

* Emerson: see his Essay on the Method of Nature.

† Hamlet.

of home;—the influence of hope,—seeing a near end to his labours, lends vigour to his limbs; helps him to measure the distance quickly; whereas when no home is in sight, and no hope of it, he feels neither spirit nor vigour; in the same way, a workman, having before him a long day, has no spirit to anticipate the close; but wearily and doggedly awaits it, in sullen apathy; whilst a hope of a speedy close, would sweeten toil, and give wings to time.

This is the philosophy of common sense. There is just one other fact to be mentioned, in connexion with the physical nature of man; namely, the requirement of pure air;—as the blood passes from the heart, through the arteries, to the extremities of the system, it secretes its nutritious properties, to invigorate the body; and returns, of a darker colour, through the veins, to be again freshened by the air breathed in the lungs; but when this air has become foul, by being breathed over and over again, instead of fostering the exhausted blood, by the oxygen of a pure atmosphere, it can only import back the carbonic gas which the lungs formerly threw out, and which of course can only impoverish and deteriorate, instead of refreshing the exhausted stream of life.

Excessive labour therefore, may injure in two ways, by a too extended physical exertion; or a too long confinement in a vitiated atmosphere: the former, is seen in out-door labour; the latter, in factories, &c.

But sometimes factories are an instance of both: and to shew the effect of the latter, (namely, vitiated air,) we need only mention the reviving effects of fresh air, after the languor and fatigue of confinement, in a crowded or ill-ventilated room. The only remedy for such evils, is an attention to ventilation;—an opportunity for using the baths for the working classes, now so much spoken of;—time for open air recreation; and a chance of sufficient repose.

Thus much for man as possessing a body; the evils to which this is liable, and the way to remedy them.

This is not the place for an elaborate scientific statement, in defence of our conclusions, even if our argument required it; for this would require a large treatise, and besides, would be addressed chiefly to the medical profession: it suffices us, if we have hinted at the general principles which science explains and which common sense confirms.

We have secondly, to regard man as possessing a mind; a capacity for thinking and reasoning. There are two requisites for the due development of this faculty: first, the possession of knowledge, as materials for thought; nature does her part in this respect, during childhood; through the medium of the senses: giving us thus, the primary elements of knowledge; by acquainting us with the existence and general properties of things and beings around us. The second requisite, is education; which includes the addition of such knowledge as the general experience of mankind, and the activity of improved intellects have collected. This requires to be added to the teaching of nature, which is effected during infancy. But the chief part of education, consists not so much in giving knowledge; as in training the faculties for employing knowledge properly; or for pursuing truth successfully. Knowledge and training therefore, are the two requisites for the healthy condition of the intellect. Now for all this, men want time and opportunity. It cannot be supposed

that the scanty education which the children of working men acquire, should satisfy them through life; for the mind, like the body, wants constant exercise; or men degenerate into animals; there must consequently be an opportunity for attending Mechanics' Institutes, or reading such books as may be obtained at the various libraries; and this will also have an indirect influence upon morals: for men who have a taste for reading, will be more likely to avoid the vulgar baits, with which the senses entice the unoccupied mind. If there is not a chance of forming a taste for knowledge, the little time that can be snatched, will be filled up by these baser stimulants. A man must be occupied; he has an active craving nature, that will have either thoughts or sensations; and where the mind itself is not cultivated, it must be occupied in pandering to the body: the soul must either inhabit the body royally, as a king in his palace; or wallow in it, as in a sensual sty. Thus much for the mind; it wants knowledge and training; materials for thought, and skill in using them. We will only add, that ignorance to the mind, is like famine to the body; error to the mind, is what poison is to the body; whilst real knowledge, truth, is the food of the soul. How far a man will be inclined to cultivate the intellect, when his body is wearied with protracted labour, we leave others to judge: to us it appears, that the natural result is, for the body to be compensated by a mistaken excess in sensual indulgence.

We come next to consider man as possessing a heart—social affections. These affections consecrate home, and cement society. They are the ornament and sweeteners of human life. But a man must have some of the cultivation previously spoken of, in order to appreciate and enjoy these elevating affections: *ignorance not only darkens the mind, but brutalizes the heart.* All the arguments therefore of the preceding section, add to the force of this. Knowledge renders men more domestic in their habits, and more considerate in their feelings: but if men have little time from hard labour, they require stronger excitement than home affords; even for that little time; and home is the centre of all humanizing influence; *it is the heart of all true humanity.* But should men not visit the ale-house instead of the cottage; yet if they return home too jaded in body, and too ignorant in mind for social converse, *home is no longer home, but a "lodging house."* The reality of home arises from the performance of family duties, and the enjoyment of domestic affection.

We have fourthly to consider man as possessing a religious principle. We have mentioned this last, as being man's highest endowment; a mark placed in our constitution by the Creator to ally us to himself. It is a glorious indication of man's lofty destiny. By a religious principle in man, we mean a natural tendency to, and a capacity for the knowledge and worship of God. Some have concluded that no such principle really exists; but we answer, first, that if not, man is not so noble a being as we love to consider him: he is no friend to human nature—to the dignity and native rights of men, who cuts us off from intercourse with our Maker: *for whatever throws a sacredness about the human spirit, increases the claims of the weak, and the obligations of the strong.* It is at least, never the interest of the oppressed to repudiate alliance with heaven. And secondly, we answer; the fact that superstition exists widely, and that

only those few tribes who have sunk below the level of humanity, are without visible proofs that it is natural to worship something; nay doubtless even these—the most degraded of their kind—have some objects of adoration which escape the notice of cursory or careless visitors. If therefore this principle of worship did not exist, it could not be distorted. Should not this part of man's nature then, have a chance of cultivation, that instead of being misdirected it may find its true object? Where does man appear nobler than when kneeling before the King of kings, soliciting his blessing; and leading the concert of all nature in praising the great framer of all? But how shall this highest function of man be duly performed; unless there be an opportunity for that cultivation which fits man for it; and leads him to it? And what can be a more dangerous and palpable sin, than *needlessly to deprive the Creator of that homage he claims; by unfitting man for the service he owes?* We have all a master above. If any of our friends among the working classes, should be inclined to differ from us in this part of our argument; we are sorry for it; and can only ask their forbearance; they will pardon us for this difference, and will allow us to add, that in addition to the general benign character of Christianity, the sacred obligations which it announces, bind all men to the strictest integrity, and the loftiest benevolence; and even if we could not crown our advocacy for the oppressed, by enlisting the divine authority of the Bible; still the general reasoning we have adopted, will stand of itself: though we think it is not weakened by its agreement with revelation. For our own part, we have no sympathy with the method some adopt in their plans for ameliorating the condition of the poor, by first taking away the consolations of religion, and then offering at a price which a poor man cannot pay, an entrance into an asylum where a questionable happiness here, is enjoyed at the risk of what *may be* hereafter. Depend upon it religion, is the safer side. The bare fact that it is possible and probable, gives it a claim to attention; and after all, if the Christian is mistaken, he is as well off as the rest, when he dies, and better off while he lives; for it is better to have a pleasant dream than a dismal one: but if the sceptic happen to be wrong, what becomes of him?

Irreligion *may be* dangerous. Religion cannot be. Surely then wisdom consists in choosing the safer side. If there were two roads—a dark night, and one might lead to a pit-fall, while the other certainly would not, which way should you take? Now there may be a final Saturday night; the concluding pay-day; then surely it deserves as much attention, as our weekly reckonings, which all wise and industrious men keep in their eye: religion is just applying the wisdom of a week to the concerns of a life: and as on Monday, Tuesday, &c., you bear in mind that pay-day *will* come; so during one year, and another, a wise man will look to the end—the final wages.

There is but one other observation to be made on this subject, [*i. e.* the religious nature of man,] namely, that Christianity has provided a day of rest, during which this principle is to be more especially cultivated: yet this, whilst it shews a suitability to human nature, is not to be regarded as enough; but only as shewing that *commerce must sometimes give way to higher principles*: it comes as an asylum once in seven days, when both man and beast may take refuge from the iron service of Mam-

mon : but then, to render even this institution available, there must be the various facilities mentioned before, both for body, mind, and heart : for if men are brutalized during the week, they will neither be civilized nor Christianized on the Sabbath : they will be either too wearied, or too much engrossed in sensual pursuits, to listen to religious instruction ; and will claim this short reprieve, in the name of over-wrought nature. Like a person who has allowed the usual hour of eating to pass by—they will lose all appetite during the week, for the higher advantages of the Sabbath.

If therefore men are to become perfect of their kind ; that is, to have anything like a due development of those parts of their nature, which God gave to be cultivated, there must be such an arrangement of the time of labour as shall leave opportunity and ability for the daily exercise of men's spiritual faculties. Now, as our appeal is to the *reason* of masters, [as indeed of all men,] it would be out of place to lay down precise rules about the best proportions of time : our attempt has simply been, to exhibit the great necessities of human nature ; the mistaken and injurious policy of overlooking these necessities, will therefore be sufficiently apparent. The precise method of following out these principles must be left to the kind feeling, and enlightened judgment of capitalists themselves ; whether the hours of labour shall be twelve, eleven, or ten per day, must depend chiefly on circumstances ; such as the state of trade and the nature of the employment. We may however make two observations on this point ; first, that the claims we have been advocating are higher than the claims of commerce ; and secondly, it is a mistake to suppose that a shortening of time must diminish the work ; for a willing mind, and a sound body, can do more in nine hours, than a jaded body, and a grudging mind will do in twelve or fourteen ; that is, in the long run, taking one day with another.

Besides, the tendency of commercial enterprise is to economise time ; to press more work into a less space, by the employment of machinery instead of hand labour ; and by the substitution of *mental* for *muscular power* : how much the proper education of workmen in the various parts of their nature, [as before described] will facilitate this consummation, it is easy to perceive.

It remains only that we should address a few words to the two parties immediately concerned ;—men and masters. And first, for the workmen—we have been advocating the *rights of man*, on the highest conceivable ground, namely, human nature, as indicative of *the divine will* ; and our conclusion is, that certain elements in that nature, demand proper management and culture, in order to reach that perfection for which they were plainly intended : now you may consider that these arguments are addressed principally to masters ; but whilst they involve principles as broad as our nature, and therefore are applicable to all men, they are peculiarly addressed to you ; *it is a course of reasoning with you in behalf of yourselves* : for if you see properly your own dignity as the creatures of God, you will also understand that it is your duty both to yourselves, and to God to cherish this elevated idea of your own nature, and to act in accordance with it. Now, what course of action does this point out ? Plainly this, that you should show by your earnestness in employing your

present few advantages, that you desire and deserve greater. We do not say this in the fear that you would not rightly improve better advantages, nor in the belief that this notion should withhold men's rights, on the ground that they cannot be trusted with them; but others may think so, and may make this a pretence; therefore the most triumphant advocacy of your cause will arise from the worth of your character. Above all, it should be borne in mind that all real amelioration must commence within a man's self,—others may advise, or may offer us difficulties; but we must follow this advice, and employ these facilities: artificial heat may be applied to the body; but that which quickens the circulation, which invigorates the frame, which improves the central fountain, is the best, because the most natural and enduring. So with all other improvements. Their centre must be in a man's heart and character, and they will work their way outwardly into his circumstances. Our duty here is not to flatter, but to give advice; those who are acting as we recommend will not quarrel with the recommendation; and those who are not acting so, are in need of the caution. Besides, what a noble source of enjoyment is open to all men in the cultivation of their minds and hearts; in the cheap literature of the day, in the bosom of their family, in their churches or their chapels. The elements of happiness are in the mind; religion and knowledge are the pearls of the soul. Every thoughtful and true man is of noble rank; he has wealth within surpassing all outward show, untouched by the fluctuations of commerce, or even by the end of life. For the intelligent Christian has an exhaustless fund of enjoyment here, and the hope of a glorious possession hereafter, where toil will be exchanged for eternal repose. Religion has the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come. How many a score of humble poverty has it rendered illustrious; cheering the desolate, enriching the poor, compensating for the comforts we have not, and enhancing those we have. This is the great leveller, for it lifts rich and poor, master and servant, to the highest dignities we are capable of,—the favour and friendship of God.

We recommend these things, therefore, to your sober consideration, being convinced that by these means you will most readily acquire your right position in this world, and by the blessing of God become fitted for the happiness of another.

But we have also a few words for masters. You will not imagine that we have written this little essay in opposition to capital. No one who has an intelligent kindness for labour will regard capital as its enemy; indeed, the least consideration would teach any one that CAPITAL IS THE ONLY TRUE FRIEND OF LABOUR. How could workmen find employment if masters did not expend capital in buildings, stock, &c.? But though capital is thus a great blessing to the labourer, and therefore has a claim to his gratitude and esteem, it has also its duties; and these duties we have been endeavouring to trace in the lineaments of man's mind. The blessings of capital should not end in mere employment; but that employment should be so arranged as not only not to prevent, but to encourage the growth of the workman's higher faculties. Perhaps it will appear paradoxical, but it is true, that EVERY DUTY WHICH MAN OWES, HE OWES TO HIMSELF. We do not wish to advocate the "selfish theory" of morals,—that is, to base man's duty on his interests; but it is a con-

soling circumstance, that whilst we should not do right simply because it is best for us, yet our duty and interest will in the long run coincide. "Honesty is the best policy;" but he is a knave whose honesty is founded on this maxim. To illustrate our statement, that every duty a man owes, he owes to himself. We may mention first in general, that if a man succeeds in cheating others, together with his meaner gain, he has acquired a degraded character—a soiled nature; and this is more than compensation. And further, to explain our point, we may mention in particular as bearing on our present subject, first, that a proper attention to the culture of working men—indeed of the poor in general—adds to the security of property. What but the decency, the morals, and religion, which to a considerable extent grace and guide the humbler classes; what but the sense of right thus acquired and guarded, gives stability to the institutions of our country? The extension of this elevated character, by means of education, would act as a breakwater against the waves of faction; such as the fiercer elements of the French revolution, which were only the stirring up of the ignorance and brutality which the rich had allowed to accumulate amongst the poor; or such as some of the outbreaks amongst our own working classes, in times of national distress; or our agricultural incendiaryisms. It is too late to preach order to an exasperated people; the preaching should have commenced earlier, and then workmen (even in the madness to which occasional distress reduces the well-meaning,) would be able to see that these commercial fluctuations do not arise from the cupidity of masters, nor always from the folly of legislators; and they would, most of all, be unwilling to forget that this better understanding arose from the kind consideration of employers,—in attending to the higher wants of their servants. It would remove that isolation which too often feeds popular tumults, and would prevent the repetition of that infatuated cry, "Peace to the cottage—war to the palace!" To this purpose we may quote the words of a celebrated popular author:—

"Oh late-remembered, much-forgotten, mouthing, braggart duty, always owed, and seldom paid in any other coin than punishment and wrath, when will mankind begin to know thee? When will man acknowledge thee in thy neglected cradle, and thy stunted youth, and not begin their recognition in thy sinful manhood and thy desolate old age? Oh ermined judge, whose duty to society is now to doom the ragged criminal to punishment and death, hadst thou never, man, a duty to discharge in barring up the hundred gates that wooed him to the felon's dock, and throwing but ajar the portals to a decent life? Oh prelate, prelate, whose duty to society it is to mourn in melancholy phrase the sad degeneracy of these bad times in which thy lot of honours has been cast, did nothing go before thy elevation to the lofty seat, from which thou dealest out thy homilies to other tarriers for dead men's shoes, whose duty to society has not begun? Oh magistrate, so rare a country gentleman and brave a squire, had you no duty to society, before the ricks were blazing and the mobs were mad; or did it spring up armed and booted from the earth, a corps of yeomanry, full grown?"—*Dickens*.

But secondly, this duty to workmen is a duty to yourselves, looked at in a commercial point of view, as merely *improving the implements of*

your business. This is not said in disrespect to workmen; but it is plain that they are the superior part of your machinery, and therefore any improvement in them must re-act upon your business. These hints we leave with you to be followed up by your own reflections.

Already many masters have come forward, voluntarily shortening the hours of labour; and those who hang back will in time be shamed into compliance; but they who have complied will receive their reward in the alacrity of service from refreshed bodies and willing hearts; in the blessings, instead of curses, not loud but deep, of their workmen; in the general estimation of society; in the higher recompense of an approving conscience; and in the smile of heaven.

We do not doubt but that in general the necessities of trade lead masters to deal more hardly with their workmen, than they would naturally be inclined to do. Indeed, some of you care more about your men than some of them seem to care for themselves; and many of you would take as much pride in having sober, honest, intelligent workmen, as in having a well-built factory or warehouse: indeed, you reckon the men a part of the "concern." On these grounds, then, as well as on the higher principles of duty, your plan is, not only to afford them chances of improvement, but also to encourage them to adopt these chances. Long hours render their ignorance hopeless, and their ignorance binds faster the fetters. You must not, therefore, too severely blame those unfortunate men who seem to have no desire for their own improvement; for the peculiarities of ignorance and vice consists in blinding their victims;—but your duty is, kindly to remove this blindness, and to win all to the pursuit of knowledge, virtue, and religion.

Besides, [as we have all along shown] there are grave obligations which all men of influence are under, to use their influence for good; and those who work in your business have peculiar moral claims on your care,—claims which may be neglected, but the responsibility of which cannot be evaded. A sensible, honest, moral man feels that he owes something to men; a religious man knows that he owes it also to God, who has made the rich trustees for the poor; who has seemed partial, to teach men not to be selfish; who has left the distribution of his favours incomplete, that the favoured might finish this work; who has left some more dependent, that our mutually feeble condition might give us the moral advantages of willing help and unity; who has framed us for growing in goodness, by increasing in usefulness; who has mysteriously linked together the interests of society, to teach that the highest good of every one must arise from the highest good of all; and who has no less inclination to support his laws than to fix and promulgate them.

In conclusion, we have but to repeat that we have studiously avoided laying down precise rules, which are stubborn; but have advocated principles which, taking hold of the heart, are adaptable to the various emergencies of the conduct; and in this we have imitated the spirit of Christianity, which seeks to imbue men with certain feelings, and trusts to these as the guides of life. We have sought to convince all parties that their duty and interest lie in the same direction; to imbue them with that justice and benevolence by which all will be inclined to adopt whatever plans may elevate our country, preserve and enhance her glory at home, her

pre-eminence abroad ; those plans which, above all, will alleviate toil, adorn life, bless men, and honour God.

Let workmen, therefore, examine the machinery of their own nature ; and seek, by the blessing of him who made us, to fulfil the ends he made us for ; and let employers not only not stand in the way of this consummation, but afford for it all facilities and encouragements, that the world, instead of being one great " Board of Trade," may subordinate commerce to the dignity and happiness of mankind.

THE MESMERIC MANIA OF 1851,

WITH A PHYSIOLOGICAL EXPLANATION OF THE PHENOMENA PRODUCED.

*A Lecture, by John Hughes Bennett, M.D., F.R.S.E. Professor of the Theory of Physic, and of Clinical Medicine, in the University of Edinburgh.**

AMIDST the experimentalizing quackery of *popular science*, it is refreshing to meet with observations and enquiries conducted in the true spirit of scientific investigation.

Especially to find physiologists *who take THE MIND into account*, when reasoning about our complex nature,

We cannot but do good service by presenting our readers with some main points in this admirable pamphlet.

The preface contains many sensible and important observations, some of which we can corroborate from instances that have come under our own notice :—

"During the present year, (1851,) society in Edinburgh has been greatly agitated by a *delusion*, consisting in the *supposition*, that certain persons may be influenced by an *external mysterious force*, which is governed and directed by particular individuals. Fashionable parties have been converted into scenes of experiments on the mental functions.

"The result of this excitement has been an increased degree of nervousness in individuals."

"Several instances are known to me where intelligent young men—students in this University—have, for a longer or shorter time *been incapacitated from following their ordinary occupations*, and obliged, from want of attention and mental power, to absent themselves from their classes. Some of these, from a feeling of the injury they have sustained, have very properly refused to allow any experiments to be tried on them ; and the parents of very sensitive young persons, from the obvious detriment their health has undergone, have also forbidden a repetition of these occurrences.

"That a *peculiar condition of the nervous system* may be occasioned,

* Edinburgh : Sutherland and Knox, George-street. London : Simpkin, Marshall, & Co. ; and S. Highley.

in which individuals *otherwise of sound mind* are liable to be temporarily influenced by predominant ideas, must be admitted by all who have seen anything of the disorder. Nor will the existence of such a condition appear after all very extraordinary to those who reflect on the singular phenomena occasionally presented in the *states of reverie or waking dream, of ordinary somnambulism, ecstasy, trance, monomania*, and other allied affections. In every case the symptoms consist of perversions of intelligence, sensation, or motion, identical in their character with what medical men have been long familiar. It is the manner in which they may be produced, and the frequency with which they are made to occur, that is new.

"To separate what is true from what is false, to strip the subject of the charlatanism which has been thrown around it, and offer a physiological explanation of the phenomena really produced, is the object of the following lecture."

After a concise description of "the general structure and functions of the nervous system," the Author proceeds to explain those *mental causes*—the reaction of the imagination on the body, by the presence in the mind of suggestive ideas, and the abstraction of the attention from the ordinary impressions of sensation:—to which, *exclusively*, the effects may be attributed.

"Dr. Henry Monro,* speaking of Monomania, says that 'in these cases neither the controlling agency of the will nor the reason is suspended on most subjects, though it is so on certain points; these people can guide their thoughts well enough on most questions, can see the full relations that cause bears to effect, and that mental impressions bear to external things, *but they cannot properly control those impressions which are most strongly fixed on the mind.*' This state has very frequently a stage of contest and conscious difficulty at first, when the struggle between the morbid impressions and the faculties by which to control them is great; indeed, we may say that all morbid and excessive impressions which exclude all other considerations bear the rudimentary form of this affection, though insanity cannot be said strictly to be fully developed until the contest is decided by such a victory on the part of the morbid impressions that the moral liberty to exercise their reasoning faculties on these subjects is gone."

"During the present year several itinerant lecturers have shown *that the first stage of the process here so accurately described*,—viz., that in which certain persons cannot control those impressions which are most strongly fixed on the mind,—*may be produced artificially* in about one out of twenty individuals of the entire population. Thus, if that number of persons be chosen indiscriminately, and *directed to gaze steadily at any object for about ten minutes*, a peculiar condition of the cerebral functions is produced in one or more (especially if they be young,) in which those affected may be made, not only to act upon any train of ideas which may be suggested to them, but motion and sensation may be controlled in a variety of ways.†

* Remarks on Insanity, &c. 1851.

† The mode of producing this condition may be varied, but it is in all cases essentially the same. Thus Mesmer caused individuals to sit in a kind of trough, and they

"This peculiar condition manifests itself *while the individual is gazing upon the object*—in the first instance, by a *mistiness of vision*, succeeded in some by a lassitude and desire to sleep, in others, only by stiffness of the eyelids, and in a third class by deep drawn sighs, hurried respiration, heaving of the chest, or other signs of general excitement. *If now such persons are repeatedly told that they cannot open their eyes, it will be found that they are unable to do so, especially if their attention be more strongly directed to the eye-lids by touching or pointing to them.* But on receiving permission, or on being told to open them, this is done at once.

"A very singular experiment consists in directing a person to lift some light object, such as a walking-stick, and then suggesting to him that it is very weighty,—indeed getting heavier and heavier, so that he cannot hold it. It may then be observed, *as the idea of weight gathers strength in his mind*, that the muscles of his arms supporting the walking-stick become more and more rigid, exactly as if it were a ponderous bar of iron; all his strength at length is evidently exerted to hold it, but in vain, for it falls from his grasp, he appearing exhausted and out of breath from his previous exertion.

"In like manner, in this condition *all the sensations may be increased, perverted, or destroyed, through the medium of suggestive ideas*, communicated to the mind. By fixing attention on any part of the skin it may be made to feel hot or cold, tingling and painful, or benumbed and destitute of sensibility, according to the ideas communicated.

"Lastly, the taste may be affected, and plain water made to present to such a person the sweetness of honey, the bitterness of wormwood, or the acidity of vinegar.

"Such persons also may readily be conducted in imagination to various distant countries or cities, when they will act and talk as if they were really there.

"In the same way sleep is most readily induced, and may be made so sound that all ordinary stimuli will not awake them, and occasionally sensation is for the time annihilated. Yet it often happens that at the command of him who has been communicating the suggestive ideas, they immediately awake from a condition of sopor from which local painful applications would not arouse them.* Susceptible persons may be even commanded to sleep at a particular hour on a certain day, and awake at

were directed to look at a wire placed in their hand. The Fakirs of India throw themselves into a trance by looking at the extremity of their own noses. Mr. Braid of Manchester holds an object a little above the eyes, so as to fatigue them sooner. Dr. Darling causes them to look at a small coin placed in the palms of their hands, whilst Mr. Lewis and others fix the attention of persons on themselves, or on the tips of their fingers extended towards their eyes.

* All such persons go to sleep *under the idea* that the operator exercises over them a peculiar and exclusive influence. *It is his voice*, therefore, that is associated with his dreaming thoughts. Thus, a person impressed with the fear of having his house burnt down, has been known not to have awakened when various noises have been made, or pungent odours applied to his nostrils, but has started up immediately the word fire was whispered in his ear, or burning tinder placed under his nose. A signal lieutenant under Lord Hood, after harassing and prolonged duty, could not be aroused by the ordinary means without great trouble, until his comrades found out that on shouting the word "signal," he sprang up immediately as if for duty.—(Macnish.)

a particular time, and this they will do under the idea that at the hour named some peculiar influence is exerted on them.*

"Such are only some of the phenomena which may be produced in those affected with the nervous disorder under consideration. *They admit of infinite modifications, but the symptoms are all referable to increase, diminution, or perversion of intelligence, sensation, or voluntary motion, variously combined, according to the endless train of suggestive ideas* that may be communicated to the individual. It has always been found, that the more frequently those effects are occasioned in one person, the more really may they be again induced, and the more sensitive and nervous does the person become.

"Similar phenomena to those now described have occurred in all ages, *produced in certain persons by predominant ideas*, and variously modified according to the education, politics, or religion of the period.

"*I consider it unnecessary to enter into any lengthened argument to refute the numerous hypotheses which ascribe these effects to external influences.* I know of no series of well-ascertained facts capable of supporting such a doctrine. Lately, I have tried numerous experiments with the aid of those who believe in Animal Magnetism, all of which have only convinced me that no such principle exists, and *that all the phenomena really occasioned depend on suggestive ideas communicated to the person affected.*† But while these theories scarcely merit attention, the facts

* This fact has excited great astonishment, and it has been supposed that at the hour named, the operator magnifies them; thinks of them, and may even direct an influence from his body some 50 or 100 miles through the atmosphere to the individual affected. But all such persons have been TOLD to go to sleep, and consequently received the necessary idea, in the same manner that most of us having an important duty to perform, or a journey to make early in the morning retire to rest with an impression of the necessity of waking sooner than usual, and do so accordingly.

† The various movements and manipulations of the so-called animal magnetists are wholly at variance with what should be practised if their own theory was true. For whilst their actions are highly suggestive to the mind, they are never directed in such a manner as to stimulate those muscles which are necessarily called into action, as they ought to be, did any stimulating influence flow from their fingers. For instance, when they wish to close the jaws, the hands are never directed towards the temporal muscles, but to the mouth or larynx. When a person is bent forward or made to sit down, the hands are passed from above downwards or forwards, so as to suggest the action, but never directed to the large flexor muscles by the contraction of which the action is performed. In the same manner, when a limb or the trunk is extended, it is not the extensor muscles which are principally operated on, but motions are made to represent the act of extension itself. If the hand or elbow is to be bent, they point to the joints, and not to the muscles of the forearm or arm the contraction of which produces the effect. Indeed, to operate scientifically, according to their own principles, requires a considerable knowledge of anatomy, which is by no means necessary for success as a "magnetiser."

All the experiments made before me (and they have been numerous,) having for their object to prove the influence of the silent will, have failed. Hence I conclude, that the motions, passes, and other acts of the so-called "animal magnetists," are only useful in fixing the attention, and communicating suggestive ideas. I have been confirmed in these views by carefully watching the proceedings of Mr. Lewis. His gestures are most expressive, and he conveys ideas by means of pantomimic action of the most perfect kind. Circumstances have convinced me that in the excitement of the moment he himself is often unconscious of his own proceedings. Indeed, on stating to him my belief that the effects were owing to suggestive ideas, he opposed the notion on the ground that he always told the person to do the very opposite of what he wanted them to do. In fact, when he wished a person to rise from a chair, he always told them to sit down, but

themselves are highly important, and demand the careful consideration of the physiologist and medical practitioner. Let us, then, examine into what can reasonably be advanced in explanation of these nervous phenomena.

"We have seen that sensation may be defined to be *the consciousness of an impression*, and we know that *the mind strongly intent upon an object is unconscious of those impressions which are going on around*—so that no sensation results from them.

"Hence wounds are not felt in battle, blows and falls are unheeded during the excitement of intoxication or of nitrous oxide gas, and many Indian warriors and religious enthusiasts, intent on particular trains of thought, have not suffered from any of the supposed torments which were inflicted on their bodies. These facts, then, offer a sufficient explanation to the physiologist of the occasional insensibility of somnambulists or others labouring under some predominant idea.

"Whilst, however, an individual may be *unconscious of impressions unconnected with his particular train of ideas, everything in relation to these is often perceived with extraordinary readiness*. The abolition of sensation with regard to general impressions seems to be counterbalanced by an exquisite sensitiveness relative to the one impression either actually made or suggested. Dr. Holland has very ably pointed out the effects of mental attention on the bodily organs,* showing that there are few persons who do not experience irritation or some imaginary feeling in parts to which their attention is much directed. If at night, owing to some unusual position, we feel a beating at the heart or at the temples, we easily imagine there is something alarming; the respirations are altered, if we think about them; if we suppose the mouth is dry, we immediately swallow the saliva, and render it so; if we fancy we have a cough, we cough immediately, and clear the air passages; and if we suppose any source of irritation exists on the skin, we involuntarily apply our hand to and rub the part. Nothing is more common for medical students, when first studying individual diseases, than to imagine themselves to be the victims of each in succession. Then, in certain conditions of the system, it is well known that actual pain may be produced in a part by fixing our attention upon it. Hypochondriacs are martyrs to these erroneous impressions. Supposed pains in the limbs or stomach prevent their walking or eating, and their health suffers from want of exercise or want of food. Sir Benjamin Brodie has given some singular cases where so-called nervous pains of this description have actually led to tenderness and swelling of the integuments covering the part.†

in a tone of voice, and accompanied by such gestures, as pretty clearly indicated what were his real intentions. On several occasions, he endeavoured to act on others by what he named the silent will, looking at them steadily, and standing motionless. It generally happened, however, that his own efforts were of a kind which unconsciously caused him to rise on tiptoe, elevate his head, or throw out by gesture some hint, which was immediately seized by the person operated on. Here it may be well to mention, that any one can see through the eyelids, although they be so close together as to appear shut to those looking at them. The truth of this may be readily proved by experiment.

* Medical Notes and Reflections, Chap. 5. † On Local Nervous Affections. 1837.

~~~~~  
*Reviews and Criticisms in our next.*

# THE FIRST SHAM, THE SHAM PETER, CALLED THE POPE.

---

[In the present number of "THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE," we have departed from our usual method of five divisions, in order to insert in one complete number, three Lectures, delivered in the Town Hall, Birmingham, on Tuesday Evenings, September 23rd, 30th, and October 7th, by the Rev. BREWIN GRANT, B.A. From the effect produced by their delivery, upon a very large and intelligent auditory, it was thought they would not be unacceptable to the readers of "THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE." Whilst for the convenience of non-subscribers, they will be reprinted in a separate form, and neatly bound for separate use and preservation. It is possible, that some of our subscribers may also avail themselves of the distinct publication, whilst having the Lectures in this extraordinary number bound up with the first volume of "THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE."

We take this opportunity of thanking our numerous subscribers; and requesting their hearty concurrence in extending the Periodical, especially for the next year's issue. The present number will serve as an additional pledge of the important principles maintained with intelligence and vigour in our columns; nor are we without hopes and resources for great advances in the depth, variety, freshness, and interest, with which the Scriptural views propounded, will in future be maintained. And we rely with confidence on the lovers of Bible-truth to aid us in this sacred enterprise. THE EDITOR OF THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE.]

---

THE perfection of principle demands that in the pursuit and advocacy of truth, we should not pervert or betray it to narrow aims, personal ends or party purposes; that we should consecrate ourselves to the truth, and not desecrate the truth to ourselves, our passions, prejudices, or preferences; in a word, it requires that *we* should be annihilated whilst CHRIST the Lord of truth, the truth impersonated, is alone exalted; so that when the disciples look around, they shall "*see no man save JESUS ONLY*;" as the one grand and sublime figure for the adoration of the world.

If we thus love the truth, with a pure heart fervently, we shall escape that censure perhaps too severely applied by Goldsmith to Burke;—that he "to party, gave up what was meant for mankind."

Whilst however, we should thus be free as far as in us lies, from personal aims and private regards, it may be as useful to others, as it is honourable to the advocate of truth, that his motives should be clear, and his principles of argument and action freed from obscurity and suspicion.

Not that calumny and prejudice can ever be satisfied, for these by the alchemy of hostile criticism turn gold into dross, see evil in good, find out that firmness is obstinacy; devotedness, cant; cheerfulness, levity; wit, profaneness; liberty, licentiousness; inquiry, presumption; reproof, slander; reform, destruction; earnestness, bigotry; reasoning, lawlessness! Such caprices we may not satisfy; nevertheless, we must aim so to speak and act, "that they of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of us," (Titus ii., 8) except that by the perversion of their reason, they will "say all manner of evil against us falsely."

Not for himself merely, but mainly for the good of the adversary, as well as for the establishment of the faithful, must the advocate of truth defend his own character, that none may have either fair pretences or solid reasons for stumbling, because the truth is degraded by its defenders, as a keen and well-polished sword thrust into a rusty scabbard, to lose at once its edge and its lustre. Even the Lord Jesus himself condescended to the weakness of the Jews, and referred to the testimony of John for their sakes, not for his own: "I receive not testimony from man; but these things I say, that ye might be saved." (John v., 31.) With a desire to imitate this spirit, however imperfectly, we may be allowed a few brief introductory observations on such points as may in the estimation of some invalidate our testimony on this and on a late occasion,\* against the absurdities, presumption, and superstitions of the Romish priesthood.

For so logical are our opponents, that everything to the disadvantage of our persons is set down to the discredit of our cause; and thus Christ is rejected, because Peter denied and Judas betrayed him. The first question a Romish priest or advocate asks respecting a Christian champion is, not what arguments does he use, but who is he, of what standing, and has he never fallen? If there be no flaw in his argument, is there no hole in his coat?

And to satisfy themselves they may search the central registers of the Jesuits, in which we have reason to suspect every *dangerous* man is noted down, both as to the height of his stature and of his genius; the colour of his hair and of his principles, together with any scandal that may be whispered or proved. And these *memoranda* are the arguments of the Jesuits, those universal eaves-droppers and merchants of scandal, over whose central department should be written—"rubbish shot here;" whose agents are the street-sweepers and scavengers of the world, the spiritual commissioners of the sewers; who closing their eyes to the open glory and strength of the metropolis of Protestantism, forgetting the Great Exhibition of the Industry of all Nations, the thronging intelligent population, the arsenals of warfare, and docks of merchandise,—forgetting all these, descend from the slums of Westminster into some main sewer, with a smoky torch, to discover and disturb the rats that have retired, and find in these the "*palmary arguments*" of the Protestant faith!

Blind moles, who burrow in the earth to hunt and chain the Protestant eagle, that is glancing and soaring towards the sun.

Do we misrepresent or falsify the logic of Rome? Are not all men who have left their communion, proofs and instances of their appetite for

\* In the Oddfellows' Hall, Birmingham, four "Orations to the Oratoriana," &c.

slander, and their feebleness of reasoning? Do they not say to Achilli—"You are already dead;" and, accordingly, do not the vultures of defamation, snuff the wind in the distance, and gather themselves around the dead body to pluck out the eyes, and leave a skeleton reputation that has been cleaned by their bills, and that has sharpened, but not satisfied, their rapacity?

Is it the Duke of Norfolk that leaves them? he is then of course a dotard; but his son will not follow his apostacy: he, good easy soul, (thus prophesy the priests)—will remain true to Rome, out of compliment to those pious persons who have been false to his father!\*

Is it Gavazzi? Then the lower journals of Romanism shall traduce him as an apostate Atheist priest; but this shall be general and anonymous slander; for no living priest, bishop, or cardinal in England dare in his own proper person breathe upon the pure mirror of Gavazzi's honour; the underlings fear the man whose voice swells the hearts of the people, and shakes the foundations of the Vatican.

Not to enlarge on this prolific theme,—the Roman vultures feeding on the spiritual repast of murdered reputations, we will venture a few words on the method that may be, and is, adopted to invalidate our own testimony.

Two things are whispered: first, we do this for popularity; to gain reputation, because Dr. Newman is a great man.

Most people will admit that in one point there is some little exaggeration, or, at any rate, some striking information that may well be denominated *news*—namely that Dr. Newman is a great man.

Whether it be an improper thing to aim at popularity, we leave to the priests who would pay any price for it. For the sake of others, however, as well as ourselves, we may meet this cheap and common charge—"he aims at popularity." What man in business does *not* aim at being popular, that is, extending his connexion? What teacher of truth does not seek to extend the circle of his scholars? It is *the duty of every one* who believes he has something worth hearing to try and secure an auditory. But if it be intended, as no doubt it is, that this is done at the expense of integrity, then it is as a priest's argument,—as offensive to good manners as it is unfounded in reason. Every one knows that for ourselves, had popularity been our aim, we should have entered a fast-sailing clipper, and all throughout have gone on quite a different tack—waiting for the "*trade-winds*."

At the same time, it has never been pleasant to our feelings to wound those of others by the statement of what we in conscience believed; and we trust to be withheld from any compromise of truth for outward union, or the applause of men.

They are the disturbers of the peace, the destroyers of union, who, for the sake of diversity of opinions on circumstantial questions, divide the communion of saints into isolated parties; and on the other hand, they are traitors to conscience and Christ, whose union is compromise. Let us unite where we can, and differ where we must, and respect each other for the *exercise* of that private judgment, the *right* to which we are united in defending.

\* It is rumoured that this prophecy is already falsified. P.D.

The second invalidating circumstance adduced against us, in low murmurs, to weaken our testimony is, that we *have* CHANGED SIDES. Now there is no more harm in this, than in aiming for proper purposes at popularity; they should change sides who find out their mistake.

But it is only in one direction that it is a disgrace to change; the Duke of Norfolk is of course an apostate—a fickle man, like Luther; or like Peter, who changed his trade, and left the fisherman's boat and ring to the Pope: these were sins; but it is the glory of Newman and Company to have changed sides, though Dr. Newman himself declared that "what is sauce for the goose, is sauce for the gander." Now, since "the goose" has had a share, why should not we?

The priests' pupils ask, how is it possible that ordinary men should judge of objections to Rome, when such learned men have *changed* to it? They forget that Newman's brother, equally learned, and quite as legendary and poetical in argument and language, has *changed* into an infidel; but they proceed to diminish our arguments,—for *we have changed*,—and changelings say so!

Let it be enough, then, that the argument cuts many ways; but we add, that it does not cut *this* way, for *we have* NOT *changed* in any point, either of opinion or conduct, in this controversy.

Setting aside the general growth of intellect and character, inevitable even in our short course of public life, of writing and speaking, we know of no change in any important sentiment, religious or political, beyond a clearer acquaintance with those principles and their foundations; a love to them from free and fearless reason, which has confirmed the conviction and deepened the love of those views which, under the blessing of God, it was our happiness to imbibe from parents whose character was founded in that Protestant school—the education of the divine world.

Holding to this infallible guide, unlike Newman, we have not veered about; and though we never signed creeds nor articles, the creed which God gave is engraven on our intellect and conscience, and we desire nothing more than that it may be transferred completely to our heart and life.

As for the present question, when did we ever, either in secret or on the house-tops, utter a different view of Popery to that we now advocate, and trust we shall advocate to the end? Was it in the Papal Aggression agitation? Did we then side with the Roman superstition, or only advocate a liberty for the Romanist which we knew he would not reciprocate? And because in our straight course, (consistent with itself, however different from the principles of others, to whom we allow an equal liberty,)—because in this straight course we came up with those who go zig-zag, and who met us at that point,—are we therefore to *fraternise* with priests *because* we demanded a fair field and no favour to *fight* them with Bible weapons? No, we have made good our word, and if any men were so duped by priests as to echo them and say, "he that is not against us is on our side," let them now learn that "he who is not for us is against us;" that we were on the side of their liberty, but not of their mummery. This we said then; this we say again. But, certainly, they have not borne themselves so meekly as to give any fresh reason from their conduct to intensify our liberal principles; they have done their best to dis-

gust and insult those who contended for their liberty—a liberty to endow Wiseman with a tail that requires ten men and himself to carry: which, if a man can pay for, he may be allowed in *law*; but no man in creation can be licensed by *reason* to wear such long petticoats.

We certainly are not impassible to the galling insolence and pretensions of these lords over God's heritage, their ignoring of all else, and setting up the monopoly of their ignorant and impudent usurpation: we believe they would take advantage of our liberty, to extinguish it; and they have said as much in broad hints in their infamous publications; still, though they are an organised conspiracy against the liberties of mankind: more "invidious and insolent, insolent and invidious" (the changes rung on Newman's bells), against the majesty of man than the majesty of the Queen; more dishonouring to the priesthood of Christ and the throne of God, than to the clergy of England and the throne of Victoria; still, we so rely on God's guardian providence, and the trusty sword of the divine Spirit, as for ourselves to disclaim all other aid. And those Protestants who might lament our position in that controversy, would have to be as blind as the priests are deceitful, to imagine that our position then was from any love to Rome; and now we have turned and changed, as the sunflower turns; we have kept our face towards the sun of God's truth, from which Rome ever turns away, and blinks herself whilst she blindfolds the people.

It would be as unwise, as it is unnecessary, to revive that controversy; nor are we here urging our views on others, but demonstrating our own consistency, and therefore our own unimpeachable testimony against that deadly delusion which ever has had, and ever shall have, our most uncompromising and persevering hostility, in public and private, by word and by pen.

And as long as God gives us a judgment to exercise, its most vigorous efforts will be used to expose to the scorn and indignation of mankind, the trickery of these spiritual tyrants: nor do we despair of leaving behind us an artillery of spiritual power, that shall speak when we are gone; writings on these matters, "which the world will not willingly let die," until Rome is dead against whom they are and will be written; and even then, they may be preserved and embalmed in the memory of the emancipated nations of Europe, as we shew the manacles of a captured slave ship, and preserve the monuments of by-gone wickedness, fraud and rapine, as a terror to evil doers; by the spiritual pillory in which these malefactors will be held up to the wonder and derision of coming ages.

If we had done nothing else than edit "*THE SWALLOWELL FAMILY*;"\* the art of swallowing reduced to a science, for the health of Wilberforce and Company, it would be a sufficient pledge of our future course; but they who have read "*The Keys of the Kingdom, and who Stole them*;"† "*Peter's Keys, and the Pope's Picklocks*;"‡ "*Rome's Logic*;"§ and other productions written before the Aggression, will clearly understand our infallible consistency; and every priest in the kingdom knows well what to reckon on: and they know well with what class of Protestants they have the least disposition to appear in open controversy: they know

\* A reprint from the "*Bible and the People*," with Notes and Additions. Ward and Co., 14d.

† Articles in the "*Bible and the People*."

‡ *Ibid.*

§ *Ibid.*

who are the sharp shooters, and vanguard of Protestantism; and whilst they may with some boldness attack a fortress which is weak in places, only because they in part built and weakened it; they retire before those other forces which the Bible has called into the field, inside and outside the National Church;—the popular and spiritual Protestantism of these realms, completing in the hearts of the people that Reformation which was of necessity in part marred by half hearted reformers, and is taken advantage of by whole hearted Romanists.

AND NOW WHAT IS THE HOPE OF MANKIND? IT IS THE DOWNFALL OF THE PAPACY! The millennium of Christ's spiritual presence, will be in the overthrow of a carnal Anti-Christ.

For now, during a long season, he who did let, (the Roman secular power,) is taken out of the way, "the man of sin" is "revealed," sitting on the throne of the Emperor, and in the old chair of Mahomet,—the true emblem of Mahomet's principles;—and wearing Peter's sword that was by the general of our order, commanded back to its scabbard; but this captain of our salvation will come again, in the brightness of his panoply of truth,—"whose face is as the sun," and before which the Papacy will retire, as black night, when the sun arising in silent majesty, dismisses all shadows, by the swift travelling heralds—his own radiant beams; "at whose bright presence darkness flies away!"

Till the Papacy is dissolved as frostwork in the sunshine, the nations will never be free: liberty is retarded by this ecclesiastical fraternity, plotting in all nations, against all, and for the perpetual and universal dictatorship of that Czar of the SPIRITUAL RUSSIA,—the universal bishop, who lords it over God's heritage.

Till then though priests bless the trees of liberty, they will never grow, for a priest's blessing is God's curse, *and presently the fig tree withers away*. There is not a green leaf on any tree in France blessed by the priests, who "like a worm in the bud," eat out the hopes and mock the expectation of the world.

The whole of this mighty fabric of despotism, is based on the rock called Peter, *a poor joke; a mistake in orthography; for Peter is a stone, and not a rock; and has no relation whatever to the Pope, who is neither Petros nor Petra, neither a stone nor a rock; but a great sham and cheat, a usurpation over human liberty; an insult to human reason; a disgrace to the Christian religion, and plain denial both of Christ's sole authority, and the common immunities of his faithful followers.*

THIS FORGERY OF A SHAM PETERSHIP, is the key-stone in the arch that is builded over the nations, as the prison house and cell of man's conscience and understanding: we shall take this stone out of the arch; and the fabric will fall, before the efforts of that free thought and by the lever of that gospel, which it is vainly intended to inure under the Roman vatican.

How then is the controversy to be managed;—where does the burden of proof lie? Let a writer of their own answer, whom we shall cite again as a witness, and who comes clothed "with authority." Speaking of Protestants he says:—

"I tell them, IT BELONGS TO HIM WHO AFFIRMS, TO PROVE *his own*

*assertion*; which if they refuse, the whole world will discover that they have nothing evident in the whole Bible, against the tenets of the Roman Church.”\*

In return we tell them, that since they affirm and we deny, that Peter has a successor in the Pope; *they must prove* that the supposed Primacy of Peter, was transferred to the Popes in succession for ever. And as they make it an essential of the Christian religion, they must prove it out of the acknowledged authority, the Christian Scriptures, where some how the Pope is quite overlooked, as being no essential part of Christianity; but in spirit and almost in express words, repudiated and condemned. Even Dr. Newman says, that “no conclusion is trustworthy till it has been tested by enemy as well as by friend:” now it follows that their conclusion about the Pope, who is the top and bottom of their system, is not trustworthy, till they will stand face to face, in fair open encounter, and prove their pretensions.

The one-sided talk, which omits the arguments that follow up Newman’s two-sidedness, will settle nothing, but their determination to substitute assertion for proof; asseveration for refutation; and to say and say again, that the boldness of their presumption, may win the weak to swallow the greatness of their lies. But what evidence do they bring? They wish us first to be humble; secondly, to “mortify our understanding;” thirdly, to decry the trustworthiness of human reason; fourthly, to trust to the reason of priests; and finally to take the Church at her word.

The Church is the lady that settles the question.

And who is she?—She is the law, for the CHURCH is (say they) OUR BIBLE; she is the judge, for she decides; she is the legislature, for she can alter the law and enforce additions; she is the jury, and so is secure of a verdict in her own favour, with heavy damages against the heretics. But we appeal to another court, and cite her into it, as we try the papal pretensions by a more equitable standard.

Judge: Put up the Pope! Prisoner, you are arraigned upon a charge of assuming a sovereignty over the human conscience.—Prisoner: I admit it, and can justify my claim.

How?—I have witnesses in Court who will prove it. (Aside to the Church: stand forward.) This lady will satisfy you.

Who are you?—Witness: I am the Church.

Indeed! and you call yourself a lady?—Yes.

Then I am no judge? Are you married?—No.

But you have a family?—Yes.

Indeed! Pray, then, in what capacity do you present yourself to mankind?—As “the mother and mistress of all Churches.”

Mother and mistress, yet unmarried?—I “forbid to marry, and command to abstain from meats which”—

You need not criminate yourself. But these children of yours; what are they called?—The Universal Church.

And you are their mother?—Yes.

And you are the Church?—Yes.

And the Mother of the Church?—Yes.

\* “Scriptures Mistaken, &c.”



Very curious, indeed! So you, the Church, and Mother of the Church, are acquainted with the prisoner called the Pope?—Yes.

What is the relation between you and the prisoner?—He is my head.

Indeed! Pray explain.—He is the Head of the Church, and I am the Mother and Mistress of the Churches.

I am afraid you will confuse the jury; please tell them what you know of the prisoner.—He is the successor of St. Peter.

Who appointed him to that office?—Jesus Christ declared that he is the rock.

To whom did the Redeemer give this supposed pre-eminence?—To Peter.

Is *THAT* the name of the prisoner?—No; he is called Pio Nono.

Be careful witness: *that* does not *sound much like* PETER: who, then, gave the *prisoner* this authority?—Myself.

Ah! then let me see; he is your head, and you, the body, put your own head on your *own* shoulders! By what right did you so far trespass on the credulity of mankind?—By the right of infallibility.

But who says you are infallible?—I say so.

Where?—It is not yet on record amongst the settled points; it is the *unwritten tradition of my children*.

This is a very curious affair, and must be looked into; the witness may step down, but she must be held in very secure bail for her own appearance as a prisoner next week, at eight o'clock on Tuesday evening. We will unravel the mystery of this accomplice—the mother of herself, voting her own head infallible by the genius of her heels. Prisoner, this is a very suspicious witness, and does your case very little service. Have you any further evidence?—Prisoner: I have the fisherman's seal.

Who gave it you?—The Church.

That will not do,—anything else?—I have records to prove my claim.

Where did they come from?—The Church.

I cannot receive them. But tell me, prisoner, what is your occupation?—I am the heir and successor to St. Peter's patrimony.

Where may that be situated?—In Rome.

What was Peter's trade?—He was a fisherman.

And you have taken to his pursuits. Have you a fishery in Rome?—No; I have only the fisherman's seal.

Indeed! And did your predecessor carry on his trade at Rome?—He was a Galilean fisherman.

Then why do you not go to Galilee, to claim your water and boat, and follow your predecessor?—He gave up fishing.

And you took to it?—No. I catch men.

Beware, prisoner, or we shall catch you. Where are the documents conveying Peter's patrimony to you?—Christ said to *him*, THOU art Peter.

Well, and what have you to do with that—with what Christ said to Peter?—The Church has decided that I am Peter's successor.

The Church; what is that?—It is the lady that appeared as witness.

That lady is insane; what does she mean by her head?—She means me.

Then the head is responsible for the deeds of the body: the prisoner has condemned himself; *he and that lady* are BEGGING-LETTER IM-

POSTORS, AND FORGERS OF DOCUMENTS IN EACH OTHER'S FAVOUR. Let him be looked after.

[We entirely agree with the judge's decision].

There are three sources of evidence to which we may look in deciding the claims of this vicarship of Peter, namely, tradition, history, and Scripture; in other words, psuedo-history, profane history, and Scripture history.

And, properly speaking, we have to decide two points from these sources of evidence: first, had Peter any supremacy at all; secondly, is this transferred to the Pope. Now if *Peter had no supremacy*, and the Pope claims one in his name, the Pope is a SHAM PETER; if the Apostle had a supremacy, and it is not *transferred* to the Pope, Pius is still a SHAM PETER. In the first case the Pope is unlike Peter; in the second, he has no connexion with Peter.

I. First, then, we glance at TRADITION. Tradition is that general hereditary rumour which is unsupported by strict evidence of facts and documents. So at least *it is a very poor foundation for infallible certainty*, though it is the only foundation of Papacy. Moreover, tradition, or even history, can speak only of what the Popes of Rome were supposed, or pretended, to be; but the question would still come, whether these pretences are right. We find many mistakes in the early Churches; and so *the traditions that come after*, may only be falsehoods, that grow because the Apostles are no more alive to write fresh epistles.

The question, whether an individual descends from certain parents, is not to be decided by any gossip of nurses and neighbours that comes afterwards, for he might be changed for another *in his youth*. We must look to the beginnings of things; the evidence of the facts at the outset, not old wives fables, which grow up afterwards. TRADITION IS AN OLD GOSSIP, AND A NOTORIOUS LIAR, and is the only witness for the Pope.

The worthlessness of Papal tradition on this point, has been effectually exposed by one who, though high in the Romish Church, became a Protestant through writing the "History of the Popes."\*

The chapter by this Author, on "St. Peter," sufficiently indicates that we have no reason to believe that Peter was ever in that city; and we invite any priest to adduce the least evidence that Peter ever set foot in Rome. The whole rests on the *same tradition* which tells us that Peter went to oppose Simon Magus at Rome; and that when Simon by the help of Satan, and to the astonishment of the Romans, flew up into the air, Peter invoked the name of Christ, and fetched the magician down with such force that he was considerably injured. This tale of a flying Dutchman is, we are told, abundantly supported, by showing the stains of Simon Magus's blood on the stone upon which he fell, and the marks or indentations of Simon Peter's knees on the stone upon which he kneeled to bring down the high-flown deceiver.

Surely the stone was very soft, to be marked by Peter's knees, and is very hard to retain the impression. If, therefore, we take tradition, must

\* See the "History of the Popes, from the Foundation of the See of Rome to the Present Time." By Archibald Bower, Esq., heretofore Public Professor of Rhetoric, History, and Philosophy in the Universities of Rome, Fermo, and Macerata. And in the latter place, Councillor of the Inquisition.

submit to tradition, and take down such things as (though *supported by the very same authority*,) can enter no archway, except the throats of those pre-eminent members of the Swallowell Family—Newman and Wilberforce.

Besides, we must also believe that there were three bishops in one diocese,—in other words, three Popes at once, viz., Peter, and Paul, and Linus, whom Peter consecrated as his successor, which is perhaps the reason for the Pope's triple hat : so he is a condensed vicar of Christ, Peter, Paul, and Linus ; and, therefore, there is no ignoring of English bishops by the introduction of Romish into the same diocese, contrary to all ecclesiastical ideas by which three or even two bishops in Rome at once unbishop each other.

Every one knows that the early history of most people is traditional.\* Romulus and Remus were suckled by a wolf; *and now the same Rome sends us ANOTHER SHE-WOLF to suckle heroes*,—the Mother and Mistress of all Churches ; but as Niebulve and other historians have dispelled the mist of secular Rome, so the traditions of ecclesiastical Rome melt and vanish by historical investigation.

And if Peter *had* been in Rome, this would be of no greater service to the See of Rome, than his presence in Jerusalem is to the Jerusalem Bishopric. There is, however, one tradition in which we believe, namely, that the same Church which preserves the blood of St. Januarius at Naples, has also a bottle of the Egyptian darkness, which is, we believe, shown to the inquisitive ; for darkness is all Rome has to show ; and that little bottles of it is so thoroughly the essence of darkness, that though they corked it fast, enough escaped at one time to overshadow and becloud the greater part of Christendom.

We cannot but suspect that Dr. Newman has put at least the cork of that bottle to his lips, as his true helicon, to inspire him with such opacity of understanding—since “if the light that is in them be darkness, how great is that darkness.” Tradition itself is but the escape of clouds from this Roman bottle ; and by these traditional mists, they seek to pass off on the world their Sham Peter.

II. Secondly, we glance at HISTORY, to see how far this supports the power of the Sham Peter as a perpetual inheritance ; how far it came from the Apostolical ages, or grew up under the darkness of ignorance, a deadly tree, watered with the blood of martyrs, and enriched with the spoils of human liberty.

And, here, since perverts are adduced as learned examples, we adduce a convert, whose learning was like Aaron's rod, compared with the pretences of our modern legendary perverts and antiquarians.

We need only read the Preface to Bower's “History of the Popes,” to find illustrations of the Papal power, its infamous rise, and enormous growth. It is enough here to state one point, that in the beginning of the seventh century (in the year 606) Boniface III. having craftily insinuated himself into the favour of Phocas, obtained of that traitor and murderer the famous rescript, settling the supremacy on the See of Rome, in opposition to the claims of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Phocas

\* See Preface to Macaulay's “Lays of Ancient Rome,” for some beautiful illustrations of legendary or traditional lore.

was the more easily persuaded to decide the controversy between the (two rival) Sees (of the two rival cities), Rome and Constantinople, in favour of the See of Rome, because of his hatred to Cyriacus the Patriarch of Constantinople, who, unlike the Roman Bishops (Boniface and his predecessor Gregory the Great), had remonstrated with the Emperor for his crimes, whilst the Roman Bishops had palliated his conduct. This Phocas had "settled himself on the imperial throne by the murder of Mauritius, his lawful Sovereign, and the massacre of his six children, and of all his friends and relations. Five of the children he caused to be inhumanly butchered in the presence of their father." This man's rescript gave to the Popes that supremacy for which the two rival hierarchs of Rome and Constantinople had long contended; and afterwards the Pope's fetched about for a divine right to uphold a human wrong, and they stumbled on the fable of Peter's supremacy and their succession!

Such is the testimony of one who had ample opportunities of examining, and every motive of prejudice and interest to remain in the Roman Church. His book is a sufficient warrant for the summary in the Preface. The beginning of Popery is like its progress and its maturity: the Universal Bishopric began under the auspices of a tyrant and a murderer; it goes on by tyranny and murder. It is the tyrant over individuals, the fomentor of wars, the disturber of kingdoms; it is the great monster nuisance and climax of iniquity. The author of "the History of the Popes," commencing as a Papist, soon became a Protestant, and gave to this free country to complete his work, as a warning to others.

Certainly, the stream of history does not tend to prove the divine origin of the Papacy: "by their fruits shall ye know them." Nor is it in the nature of history to prove the right of any spiritual domination, even though mildly exercised.

III. We turn, then to SACRED HISTORY; the documents of historical and doctrinal Christianity to search for this Papal primacy. The first thing obvious is, that the Pope is never mentioned; and that the inspired word, though telling everything about Christ, says nothing of the Roman organization, outside of which, as they say, we cannot be saved; therefore, either the inspired word is worthless, not teaching the way of salvation; or the Pope is a vast impertinence. Either the Bible, written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, is a ridiculous failure; or the Pope is a ridiculous Sham. The Papal supremacy is the essential point of Papacy, *on which they say even Christianity depends*; yet Christianity, in its inspired documents, never mentions this essential point! So the New Testament does not teach Christianity!\*

Even the supremacy of Peter is a false pretence; and, therefore, the

\* Speaking of the progress of his historical inquiries when a Roman dignitary, Archibald Bower, observes, "In spite of my then endeavours to the contrary, reason getting the better of the strongest prejudices, I began to look upon the Pope's supremacy (utterly unknown during the first three centuries), not only as a prerogative quite chimerical, but as the most impudent attempt that had ever been made. I say, in spite of my endeavours to the contrary; for I was very unwilling to give up a POINT UPON WHICH I had been taught by Bellarmine (Bellar. Pref. de Sum Pont) that the WHOLE OF CHRISTIANITY DEPENDS; especially in a country where a man cannot help being afraid even of his own thoughts, since upon the least suspicion of his only calling in question any of the received opinions, he may depend upon by more cogent arguments than in *Mood and Figure*."—*Logical Forma*.

succession of the Pope is a double falsehood, pretending to be the vicar of Peter, who has no vicar, and to be the successor of Peter in what Peter never possessed. They who ransack tradition for tales, or history for events respecting Rome's elevation, should at least consult the history of the New Testament, in which Peter has no authority over other Apostles; but is himself entirely eclipsed by the Apostle Paul.

It was with great difficulty that Peter was induced to visit a Gentile; and even then he returned to the duty he seemed most attached to,—the instruction of the Jews; insomuch that PAUL, who was converted about the time of Peter's vision and mission to Cornelius, was described as a *chosen vessel to bear the name of Christ "before Kings and the Gentiles."* And Peter had nothing to do, either with this mission or with Paul's baptism; but *Ananias, one unknown to ecclesiastical fame, receives Paul into the Church;* PETER IS NEITHER EMPLOYED NOR CONSULTED. So Paul was not in Peter's line. And when Paul joined the Apostles, he declares that *they added nothing to him*; gave him neither knowledge nor authority. So WAS PETER'S SUPREMACY IGNORED by him who was "not a whit behind the chiefest of the Apostles," and whose only submission to Peter was to withstand him to the face, because he was to be blamed. Who dare so deal with the Pope. And after Paul is appointed to the universal office, his labours are recorded in the Acts, whilst Peter is almost passed by,—left in obscurity with the Jewish converts. And Paul proceeds to write nearly all the letters, telling us that he has the apostleship of the Gentiles, and Peter that of circumcision, so that the ONLY SUCCESSOR TO PETER IS THE SECRETARY of the *Society for the Conversion of the Jews*. Peter was no bishop at all, but an Apostle; and was confined chiefly to the Jews: the Pope is not an Apostle, but a so-called Bishop, and is confined to the Gentiles.

Peter's Lord would not divide the property between two brothers, saying he was no divider of secular goods; but the Pope claims kingdoms, and distributes international injustice. Peter's master refused to be made a king: the Pope tries hard to keep being one. Our Lord refused the kingdoms of this world; but the Pope, who is vicar of Christ as well as of Peter, has struck a bargain with Satan, taken the bribe, and will have to return it, as his contract is nearly run out.

Peter was a married man; the Pope forbids and disowns it, and says that Peter put away his wife; whereas our Lord restored her to health, and forbade the putting of them away save for adultery: so they must either traduce Peter's wife, or deny Peter's Lord.

The perverts send their wives to a nunnery; but Peter had no such asylum in which to bury his widow alive, like Roman Hindoos. Peter, with the keys of the kingdom, opened the Gospel to the Jews and proselytes on the day of Pentecost; the Pope pretends to have the keys, that he may lock the gospel up,—first in a musty library,—second, in the second-hand vulgate Latin,—third, in the sense of the Church,—fourth, in infamous notes,—fifth, in pastoral licenses. Peter wrote epistles, but no bulls, nor ever signed with the fisherman's seal; therefore, the Pope is not only a Sham Peter, but a very clumsy sham.

Peter said, I exhort the elders, being myself an elder, feed the flock of God not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready

mind. The Pope commands and forces, by virtue of *Apostolical* obedience.

Peter forbade them to be *lords* over God's heritage ; the Pope says he is a lord, and he requires the filthy lucre of purgatory money and Peter-pence, which should be called Pope-pence. Peter said, silver and gold have I none ; the Pope says, I have the revenues of kings, and tax the world. Peter said, "all of you be subject one to another;" the Pope says, all of you be subject to me.

Is he not a SHAM PETER?

Does not Newman tell us that we can detect the false only by presenting the true? Here, then, is the false Peter detected by the presence of the true Peter. Not only do they exalt Peter to a supremacy which did not belong to him, that they may sit in Peter's chair which does not belong to them, but they insult Paul, who said, *I have the CARE OF ALL THE CHURCHES*: he did not think of Peter as sharing in his authority. So they next steal the Apostle Paul's signature, and say they are successors to both. They say the Evangelists, enumerating the disciples, write *first* Simon called Peter ; and, therefore, because first on the list, he is primate. But Paul says, and he speaks not of numeration, but of rank, God hath set in the Church *FIRST APOSTLES*, so all the Apostles were first: hence there was no individual primacy ; and, therefore, the Pope had better succeed them all. And because the Apostle Paul, withstood Peter to the face, they say, this does not remove the primacy (a thing that does not need removing, since it does not exist) ; this fabled primacy, they say, was not removed by this, because an *inferior may withstand a superior, when that superior is wrong. But this gives the right of private judgment*, and DESTROYS THE AUTHORITY OF SPIRITUAL SUPERIORS, who are in God's place, as the Pope's priests pretend ; and, therefore, inferiors have no business to think them wrong.

But Dr. Challoner is very bold, and says, that the command to be humble is consistent with lordship, for Christ being Lord, was yet also a servant ; though humble, he is our ruler. But the hypocrites do not add, that Christ also says, it SHALL NOT BE SO AMONG YOU ; BE NOT YE MASTERS, for ONE is your Master EVEN CHRIST ; and ALL ye are brethren.

And Peter says, do not lord it over God's heritage ; but the Pope says, I am a Lord, the ruler of Christendom ; then, Sir, you are a Sham Peter. The Pope is styled his "holiness;" Peter said, I am a sinful man, O Lord.

Christ called Simon, Cephas, or a STONE ; and Paul warned men against setting up the authority of one Apostle above another ; for one saith, I am of Paul ; another, I am of Apollos ; and I of CEPHAS,—that is, of Peter,—in other words, I AM A ROMAN CATHOLIC. So Paul condemned the Roman heresy in his days.

And Christ said, call no man father on earth ; for one is your father in heaven,—that is, call no human being your spiritual father in the sense of your soul's ruler ; now the Pope is *father*. It is the name Christ forbade, and used in the way Christ forbade it, namely, as a spiritual master and authority. And this FORBIDDEN ELEMENT is by the Pope made THE ESSENTIAL of salvation. The fathership is the centre and sun of the system ; hence Wiseman says, England has returned to her orbit round

the centre of unity ; that is, to the Papacy or fathership which Christ condemned. So *they make that essential which is forbidden*. For the Pope in Italian, is *Papa*, and his religion is not Christianity, but *PAPA-cy*, fathership condemned in express terms by the centre of Christianity. Therefore, in all things the Pope is a Sham.

We have in the Exhibition the Koh-i-Noor, or Mountain of Light, a gem of rare value ; and a manufacturer has undertaken to give us facsimiles of it—glass imitations. But should he exchange the imitations for the diamond, and sell his glass for a precious stone, it would be an infamous robbery. So our Lord made Simon into a precious stone—a gem, and the Pope comes to pass off upon the world a most wretched and gaudy flash imitation, and charges dearly for the sham. It is time the eyes of his followers were opened ; it is time that the nations repudiated, in the name of reason, in the name of liberty, in the name of our common manhood, in the name of Christ and his gospel, this Papaship, which holds the world in spiritual childishness ; and, breaking away from the wiles of this Dalilah-Church, arose in renovated power (the spirit of the Lord coming on them mightily,) to pull down this temple of the Philistines, and bury for ever the God Dagon, the Fish God, the Fisherman's Sham !

---

# THE SECOND SHAM, THE SHAM CHURCH,

CALLED

## THE INFALLIBLE, ETC.

---

It would seem that Birmingham, the heart of England, is chosen as the grand point of attack on which the Roman invaders concentrate their choicest forces, composed of deserters and spies, who have staid long enough in the Protestant citadel to find that they could not open the door to the enemy, and so have entered upon the forlorn hope of scaling the walls with a troop of runagates and spiritual desperadoes.

Fortunately, they have found it hot work; for whilst they relied on the faithlessness of the officers and regular troops, they have discovered that the civilians are the true strength of Protestantism, and will hold the fortress whilst they drum out the regiments—horse and foot—and rout them, after allowing an honourable retreat to these non-natural defenders.

Never was a more ill-concerted expedition,—relying on the faithless to pervert others: whereas they receive only their own again; they go out from us because they are not of us, and take nobody with them. No! the rector or vicar of a parish shall go over to Rome and not carry off so much for a trophy as one washerwoman's bonnet. The villagers stare, and the townsmen shrug their shoulders,—and *follow*? No, but petition for an evangelical in the interim, till the remnants of Rome are obliterated from the established formularies.

The Psuedo-King we have already dethroned by the verdict of Scripture, and a contrast between the original Peter and the priest's flash imitation. The pretensions of a "*man on earth*" to be called our authoritative spiritual "*Father*," Papa, or Pope, were utterly annihilated by the express words of Christ; and by the contrast between the Pope and Peter, the Pope and Christianity. But if the Pope be destroyed, what becomes of Popery, which is founded on him? It gives way to Christianity, which is founded on Christ.

Is there any priest in all England who dare venture to defend the Pope's claims to a supremacy vested in Peter? If so, let him stand forth; if not, let the Papist's close their mouths in silence and shame.

Dr. Newman, the patron of the Mandarins must no longer complain that the "Pope and Pagan go together," for Popery is Paganism; nor need he condemn the toast which he has celebrated—"the Pope, the



Devil, and the Pretender" (p. 69),—for these three go together; and the Pope is two of them, being both Pretender and Pope, whilst the person named between them proclaims the banns and unites the illustrious pair.

The Pope is based on tradition, and Popery is based on him; but Dr. Newman confesses that he is "*not content* with tradition;" therefore he should abandon Popery, which rests on the "great red turtle," called the Pope, who in turn rests on nothing but one of Newman's "first principles," which he acknowledges cannot be proved. So the Pope's assumption consistently rests on assumption.

We will, therefore, dismiss the Pope with the emphatic exposure of our Lord himself, the only universal bishop, the only true priest, and no false priest can gainsay his words. Remember, then, that in Matt. xvi. 17—19 the supposed primacy was given to Peter; but it plainly was not received as any settled authority for that Apostle, since we find that in two chapters afterwards (Matt. xviii. 1—6) the disciples *DISPUTED* who *should be the greatest* in the kingdom of heaven.

OUR LORD, THEN, SETTLED IT FOR EVER, without any mention of Peter or even the owner of Peter's shadow. The Protestant may rely on his own translation, whilst the Romanist may read the *settlement of the primacy*, in the Roman Bible, collated with the Douay Old Testament and Rheims New Testament, with the *APPROBATION* of Dr. Murray, in 1846.

Matt. xviii. 1—6; Mark x. 32—36: Who then is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven, the man who rules all, or the man who serves all? The men who in splendour are surrounded with priests and gentry to kiss their ring and prostrate themselves, while the barefooted and ragged children of ignorance and delusion lie down at the feet of these lordlings, who may trample on their necks as they trample on their reason—are *these* the greatest? And who offends the little ones of Christ, but such as despise the laity and curse the heretics, who in Christ's name lift their eyes to heaven, instead of casting them down before the dazzling usurpation of Levitical Brahmins, and the grand Llama of Rome?

So, then, Christ himself condemns the Pope and his supremacy, whilst the Apostles stand round and say, "We, in our ignorance, disputed of greatness; but our master told us of littleness and humility, and made us ashamed of ourselves, by the lesson of a little child."

Wherefore let every mother thus answer the priests and their Pope, as she lifts her child on her knee, and gives them a divine lesson of Christian greatness.

## SECOND SHAM, THE SHAM CHURCH.

And now we come to the second Sham—the SHAM CHURCH, fitly associated with a Sham Peter; for we care not to enter far into the side-questions of gossip and small talk, which suit the understandings and policy of the Newmans and Wilberforces; but drive right home at the great points, and join issue with them at once on the fundamental inquiry—*is the Pope what you pretend? is your Church what she says?* The questions we have undertaken to discuss attack at once the *three legs of the PAPAL TRIPOD*, the pillars and buttresses of this vast fabric

The Rev. Father, in effect, assures his convulsed auditory that it is painful, but necessary for him to laugh at our Protestant follies; yet he smiles through his tears, since it is so very wicked that he sees nothing to laugh at, but rather a reason for crying, and so he crosses the two, and

“Grins horribly a ghastly smile.”

He pities our simplicity, and sheds crocodile tears of compassion, because the crocodile of the Tiber cannot persuade us into his jaws. Surely, then, if the doctor can afford to smile, we may deride his folly and compassionate his victims.

Let it be a settled maxim, then, for which we have abundant more evidence, dare any priest openly question the statement, that the Church of Rome spoken of by the priests, is nothing at all but a false image made up of false words, and does not exist in reality—in heaven or on earth, or in the waters under the earth.

Some tell us the Church is *all the baptized*; and this includes the baptism of heretics, though Rome alone can give true baptism! So, to hear the Church, we must go everywhere to hear everybody; or everybody must hear himself.

Again, this Church is said to be composed of all outwardly in communion with Rome; but, it is added, the truly faithful are the soul, and the merely outward the body of the Church. So the true Church is not seen. Its faith is not a matter of sight; the soul of Rome is an invisible Church.

But their grand scheme is *two Churches*, one mainly of the faithful or laity, the other of the clergy; and the former Church is to hear the latter. In fine, every man is to be a dupe of a priest, under the *fancy* of a Church.

# THE THIRD SHAM, THE SHAM BIBLE,

THE

DOUAY AND UNWRITTEN BIBLE, CALLED TRADITION.

---

THE Apostles Peter and Paul had little time to occupy seats : the chief place which Paul occupied at Rome was in prison, for we *know* HE was at Rome ; but his seat was in the Inquisition, where alone we are to look for the true successors of the Apostles in that city.

Even according to their own account Peter's seat was not the grand Mahometan chair in which the Pope now sits ; but *the cross on which they say he was crucified with his head downwards*. Let the Pope, then, mount Peter's chair, and the world would ring with Hosannas ! He prefers advancing heretics to that honourable position.

All these pretences are set up to afford the Universal Church a local seat and a visible head ; whereas, when Christ was visible, he was unknown ; and, therefore, he said, "*It is expedient for you that I go away* (become invisible) ; for if I go, *I will send*"—NOT PETER, NOT THE POPE, but "the Comforter," the Holy Ghost, which is invisible, and is Christ's vicar. And we are to look "*not to the things which are seen, but those which are not seen ;*" to "walk by faith and not by sight ;" whilst the Romanist looks at what is seen—a visible head, and walks by sight and not by faith. The Christian says, "whom having not seen, we love ; and whom, *though now we see him not, yet BELIEVING*, we rejoice with joy unspeakable, and full of glory."

The one is carnal, and appeals to the senses, the bodily eyes ; the other is spiritual, and appeals to the mind, the eyes of our understanding. One is earthly, the other is heavenly.

The Christian lives ever, as "seeing him who is invisible ;" the Papist lives ever as seeing him who is visible ; the one is the raree show and Bartholomew Fair of mountebanks and harlequins : the other is the solemn grandeur of spiritual truth, commended to every man's conscience in the sight of God. The one is the policy and the craft of men to the enslaving of every follower ; the other is the power and the wisdom of God to the salvation of every believer.

The stalking horse behind which the fraternity of priests hides its serpent-like subtlety, is the convenient figure of the Church, an ideal creation to fill men with loyalty and chivalrous devotion towards a figurative

woman, not the true Church of the living God, composed of uncanonized saints, those whom God has canonized by his grace; but the scarlet woman, to whom the faithful are called upon to do homage. This is their grand fetch of human policy, to talk ever of a woman who never appears, and insult the true spouse of Christ, those living Christians who are required by priests to transfer their fealty from the Saviour to this spouse of the Pope, who professes to marry his own body, as the head and shoulders should be united, though not by the sacrament of matrimony. The Pope espouses the Church, the Pope is the head of the Church, whilst she is also married to her own children—the other bishops.

This pretended Church is the card they play—the queen of the pack, supported by the knave of clubs,—deception backed by force, as gamblers who first cheat, and then answer with violence the remonstrances of their victims.

As Vulcan with his axe opened the head of Jupiter, whence Minerva sprang, a full-grown and full-armed goddess, so the Vulcan of necessity—greedy avarice of money and power—the father of sacerdotal invention struck the head of the priests, and out sprang the Church, the Virgin Queen of Monks, to retain in the garb of Christianity the old Pagan sway; whilst the Pope, her platonic paramour, has retained the marks and line of his succession, by keeping up the title of the old hoary high priests of Pagan Rome, Pontiff—*Pontifex Maximus*, the Universal Bishop of Heathendom.

A schoolboy in secular learning knows the meaning of the Pope's pontifical title. A schoolboy in a Sabbath Testament-class knows how well it is applied. Thus we have the genealogy of the Pope, and the origin of his spouse, the Church, the "Great Mother" of Newman and other children; she is nothing but the figure-head on Peter's boat; *l'esprit du corps* of priests; the uttered and impersonated concentration of their insolence, tyranny, and unsanctified ambition. Both she and Minerva sprang from the brain of mythologizing priests; both are weaponed, both are praised, and neither is real.

Therefore we bid farewell to the Pope and his spouse, the grandpapa, and the grandmamma, since we are no more children, but have put away childish things,—no more children of a Church, but children of our Father in heaven, sons of God through faith in Jesus Christ, to whom alone every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, to the glory of God the true Father, the only Father of his family, the Church of his Son our Redeemer.

### THIRD SHAM, THE SHAM BIBLE.

We now come to the third Grand Sham, THE SHAM BIBLE; or the Roman method of either *withholding or nullifying the divine word*, the relation of the Roman confraternity of the Holy Scriptures.

We shall arrange our observations on this subject under three heads, taking only the main points; but yet sufficient to bring the controversy to a manifest issue.

First, the conduct of the Roman corporation of priests in reference to the Bible.

Secondly, the principles on which they justify their conduct, and claim both the ownership of the Scriptures, the right to give or protect, and to explain them with a final and authoritative voice.

Thirdly, the refutation and exposure of these principles:

The first of these topics will, we fear, be a little tedious, as entering somewhat into detail; but we shall rely upon the candid spirit of earnest inquiry, to bear with the necessary points of historical facts in the conduct and position of Rome, respecting man's light and God's light, reason and the Bible, for both of which the Roman Church is the extinguisher. When these fundamental questions are settled, there is clear scope for attacking the separate doctrines of Rome.

We shall, however, first prepare the way by a clear statement of the questions at issue in this part of our investigation.

The Roman priests DENY OUR COMMON RIGHT TO THE BIBLE; they deny THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE BIBLE; they deny THE NECESSITY FOR THE BIBLE; and, on the contrary, assert THE RIGHTS OF THE CHURCH, THE NECESSITY FOR THE CHURCH, AND THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE CHURCH. Three denials and three assertions, which should be well studied, besides being committed to memory, as the whole controversy stated in a few words: three denials and three assertions; every one false in the meaning and for the purpose intended;—six sacerdotal fabrications, the staple manufactures of that firm which “makes merchandize” of mankind “by feigned words,” and lying wonders, and lighted candles, and *hocus pocus et hoc omne genus*.

These are the saints that, as Newman says, “shine in the dark;” but are absorbed, lost, and eclipsed by the light: the saints that, as Newman says, sail over the sea on a cloak—the cloak of Phariseism, pretensions, and hypocrisy. These are the saints who, should any unmask them, have an army of spies dressed in invisible green, armed with the poisoned *stiletto* of slander, to stab in the back those whom they cannot look in the face. But God covers his champions with an invulnerable panoply, so that nothing can harm them; for should men kill the body, they have nothing more that they *can* do, else they would; but even this, like the crucifixion of the Redeemer, is but the avenue to glory, the hastening of the coronation and consecration of those who are kings and priests unto God for ever!

Let us, then, examine first the conduct of the Roman conspirators in reference to the word of God. What have they done to extend it? what to hinder it? How far do they put the gag into the mouth of Jehovah, forbid God to speak, and put their fingers upon the ears of the laity.

Mr. Langdale having stated at a York county meeting that he “could show a Paper from the Pope enjoining all classes to read the Bible. A correspondent wrote to the *Times*, as follows, to show the *absurdity of the injunction*, when at Rome, in the winter of 1847;—this writer sought for an Italian Bible: “I sought for one,” he says, “at all the booksellers in Rome, but without success; but one day, when I had nearly given up the search as hopeless, I entered a shop not far from the College of the Propaganda, I made the usual inquiry for the Old and New Testament in the Italian; and the shopkeeper replied that he had *one* copy. ‘Good,’ said I, and began to feel for my purse. ‘Stop,’ said the tradesman very honestly;

'you had better see it first.' He mounted some steps, and after much diving, pulled out a dusty copy of the desired work *in five or six volumes quarto, the price for which unbound was, I am sure, not less than FOUR POUNDS*. It was, of course, an 'authorized copy,' with an enormous *mass of notes*. But to enjoin the people—the poor, the Roman poor—to read the Bible, of which the only copy I could find in Rome cost so much, was little less short of mockery. The Pope, as temporal sovereign, enjoys a comfortable income, why not have 20,000 copies of a cheap authorized edition struck off, to give them a chance of fulfilling his injunctions? I know one instance, in which a general officer, long resident at Rome, gave an Italian Bible to a Roman lady, which was taken from her by her confessor," &c.—P. (*Times*, Nov. 26, 1850.)

Another gentleman says, "a female servant (a German) we had, not long since, expressing a desire to learn something of the Protestant faith, my wife supplied her with a Bible. Some time after, upon my wife asking her what she thought of it, she stated that she had parted with it, *because the first time she went to confession* the priest told her it was 'A CRYING SIN' to look into such a book or even to possess it. She had to do some *penance* for the fault."—J. B., Hackney, (*Times*, Nov. 27, 1850.)

This *penance* or despotism over the bodies and minds of servant girls usurped by the priest-negro-drivers, reminds us of a case we heard from a Manchester gentleman, since the preceding lecture. He had a Catholic servant, and she was fond of her place, and gave satisfaction; but told her mistress with tears that she must leave. Why? Because I attended family prayer: and the priest will not let me stay.

She had already done penance in the house, by *wearing cinders in her shoes*, &c. She afterwards tried to get another place, but was refused on account of her religion, and dare not return to the comfortable home from which the priest had spiritually expelled her. So she returned to Ireland, to live on potato peelings, and give the potatoes to the priests.

These are present facts of priestly tyranny; but, lately, the *Glasgow Free Press* had been twitted with being a *free slave* of priests; and after denying the charge, boldly did penance, by saying that Bishop Murdock, or any Roman bishop, had absolute power over the "*free press*."

But to return to the history of Rome and the Bible, the following sketch, abridged from an extract from "Archdeacon Wilkin's address to his parishioners of St. Mary's, Nottingham," (1842) with which we have been favoured by "a member of the Church of England," is appropriate to our subject, and will prepare the way for a proper understanding of this vital question—*how has Rome acted towards the Bible?*

Extract from *Archdeacon Wilkin's Address to his Parishioners, of St. Mary's, Nottingham*, published in 1842.

"Our [Protestant] authorized version, was, by the order of King James, translated *from the ORIGINAL TONGUES*, the Hebrew, and the Greek, by *forty-eight of the most learned divines* that our Universities, or our kingdom could produce; a work, which engaged their talents for the period of three years, and was completed in the year 1600.

"It is received, read, and known throughout the whole world. But what is the Bible, used and authorized by the Romanists? One that

bears the title, 'the Holy Bible, translated *out of the Latin Vulgate*, and diligently compared with the originals.' This English translation is used by such few of the Romanists alone, as have license from their priests to read it; but in their churches and places of public worship, we suppose the Bible in use to be the Latin Vulgate, as none other is authorized; for the Council of Trent, by the fourth Rule of its expurgatory Index, thus determines;—'since it is manifest by experience, that if the Holy Scriptures [*i. e.* not merely a Protestant version] were allowed everywhere, without discrimination, in the vulgar tongue, *more harm than good will arise* from it, on account of the rashness of men; let the judgment of the bishop or inquisitor be abided by in this matter, so that with the advice of the parish priest or confessor, they may *grant* the reading of Catholic editions of the Bible in the vulgar tongue to those whom they shall have ascertained to be likely to derive no harm, from this sort of reading; which permission they must have in writing. But if any one shall presume to read or possess them, without such permission, unless he shall first deliver up such Bibles to the Ordinary, he must not receive absolution of his sins, &c. The regular clergy are not to read or purchase them without the permission of the prelates.'

"Mons. de Maire, counsellor, almoner, and preacher to the king of France, published by authority, declares, that:—'this Rule is founded in ecclesiastical right, and no man can transgress it, without contradicting that obedience which he owes to the Church, and the Holy See, from which it hath received its confirmation: for as much as this Rule was not made but in prosecution of the decree of the Council of Trent;—and no man can deny that it hath been approved of by the Holy See, and authorized by the Bulls of Pius IV., and Clement VIII.'

"This prohibition may, perchance, be relaxed in Protestant countries, with the view of bending to the prejudices of those over whom the Romish Church would obtain influence; but in Spain, the Rule was made still more stringent, permitting neither the Bible nor any parts of it to be either printed or written in the vulgar tongue; nor allowing men to keep any Bible in their possession which was already translated: \* and beyond all this, in the Index of Pope Alexander VIII., (1668) *not only Bibles translated and printed by heretics, BUT ALL BIBLES in the vulgar tongue* are strictly prohibited.† What was the advice of the bishops who made an official report to Pope Julius III., when assembled at Bononia, October, 1553? 'We have reserved the most considerable advice, which we could at this time give your holiness, to the last:—and here you must be awake, and exert all your force to hinder, as much as you possibly can, the gospel from being read (especially in the vulgar tongue,) in all the cities that are in your dominion. . . . . This, in short, is the book, that has beyond all others, raised those storms and tempests, in which we are almost driven to destruction: and really whosoever shall diligently weigh the Scripture, and then consider all the things that are usually done in our Churches, will find that there is a great difference between them. Therefore those papers are to be stifled, and you must use *caution* and diligence in it, *lest that* create us greater disturb-

\* Alfonsus de Castro adv. hæres. 1. i. c. 13.

† Biblia vulgari quocunque idiomate conscripta.

ance!’ A version of the Latin Vulgate was revised by Lucas Brugensis with the assistance of several divines of Louvain, in 1573, which was thence called, ‘the Louvain Edition.’ With this edition, Pope Sixtus V. was so ill-pleased, that he ordered a revision of it to be made with the utmost care; and he, himself, devoted considerable time and labour in correcting the proofs; he himself, also, superintending the publication of it; which was accomplished in 1590.

“The Pope declared this to be the only true and correct version of Holy Scripture. The infallible Council of Trent decreed:—‘that in public lessons, disputations, preachings, and expositions, this [*i. e.* Jerome’s version, not that of Sixtus V.] should be accounted authentic; and that no one should dare or presume to reject it, on any pretence whatsoever.’”

“Yet, in spite of this strong fence thrown around this version, [without naming any edition] a subsequent Pope, Clement VIII. discovered it to be so incorrect [even after Sixtus’s emendations] that he caused it to be suppressed; and he published *another* edition, 1592. But besides the three versions here mentioned, there were several others, each differing materially from the other. In that of Isidore Clarius, made in 1542, he complains in his preface that he found these holy writings defaced with innumerable errors, 8,000 of the most material of which he corrected, leaving, he knew not how many lesser ones, untouched. Well, therefore, might Popes Sixtus and Clement find ample room for improvement, and yet leave, as each of them did leave much more to be done towards the accomplishment of a true and correct version. Yet, in what a predicament are the Romanists placed, in thus having two Bibles equally authorized [by Sixtus V. and Clement VIII.] as authentic, in both of which are diversities and contradictions, so that they are compelled either to make no use of the Bible at all, or, as Bishop Patrick says:—“to fall under the curse of Sixtus if they escape that of Clement, or the curse of Clement if they escape that of Sixtus; for they are both of them enjoined with the exclusion of all other editions, and with the penalty of a curse upon those, who disobey one or the other, while it is impossible to obey both.’”

“What think you now of the assumption of the Romanists, in declaring that their Church can by no possibility err? Non potest errare, say they. Indeed, were it not for the consequences of ridicule, and the dissension which follow inconsistency, glad we may suppose, would they be, to have another and a third authorized version, translated as ours out of the original tongues: but this might give the shaken infallibility a final overthrow.’”

*Perhaps on no question has there been more mystification, uncertainty, and DUPLICITY, than in the pretences of Rome’s priests about their Bible, or rather, their Bibles; for they have several; but NOT ONE AUTHENTIC AND INFALLIBLE by the full authority of their Church.*

We have already quoted part of the iv. Canon of the Council of Trent, against the general reading of the Scriptures in the popular language; a council “held under the Popes, Paul III., Julius III., and Pius IV. And as there has been no council since, the Church has never spoken with authority; so the laity are left without a Bible, for the translations made

• Council of Trent. Ses. 4.



since are without full sanction, they are the work of private hands,—*private judgment*, not Church authority.

NEITHER HAVE THE LEARNED ANY BIBLE; for, whilst the council sanctioned Jerome's version of the Latin, called the Vulgate, *it did not say which edition of that version*; and two Popes have since given a variation from all then existing editions; and each one declared that *his* is the infallible standard.

So we have Popes against the council, and against one another; and people without a Church Bible. THEY HAVE NEITHER ORIGINALS, TRANSLATIONS, NOR NOTES, BY THE AUTHORITY OF A COUNCIL—the infallible Church.

They do not even pretend to have the Hebrew and Greek originals, Dr. Milner acknowledges they go no higher than the Latin Vulgate; whilst they have no Church edition even of this *second-hand original*.

These are bold statements, and we hope they will put the priests upon their own defence; first, to shew that they have a Bible, according to their own notions of Church authority; and afterwards, to prove that such Bible is critically and historically sound; and finally, that such really authoritative Bible sustains their usurpations.

We have not space here to enter very fully into the proofs of our assertion, that Rome has no Church Bible, either in the real original tongues of Hebrew and Greek, or in the sham original of Latin, or in any translation into any mother-tongue spoken on the face of the earth. The Council of Trent decided in favour of the Latin Vulgate as the only Bible; but there were several varying editions in print at the time, and no single one was selected; therefore, the council gave no Bible, and this was the first time the Church had spoken about versions of the Scriptures, viz., in 1545; and then it could only adopt the work of a private man, Jerome, whose work had been done many centuries, only had been spoiled by bad copyists, which the council did not correct.

In forty-five years after this council, Pope Sixtus V. corrected one of the many editions of Jerome, and declared by a Bull that his corrected edition was the one which the council had sanctioned! An impossibility and contradiction. Yet this Pope anathematized all who should use any other than his edition, or alter this in the least.

Then came Pope Clement, who “corrected two thousand dangerous errors” in the infallible Bible of his predecessor, and anathematized all who did not adopt his edition alone. So, if the Romanist takes a third, he is accursed; if he follows Clement, he is accursed; if he follows Sixtus, he is accursed! And this is enough for the present about *originals*.

We proceed, then, to make a few observations on translations. The Roman laity have no Church *translation*, and no Church *notes*,—i.e., no infallible explanations: they have no written guide; but are at the *mercy* of PRIVATE PRIESTS. Private priests at Rheims and Douay, translated the Latin Vulgate into English, and added notes. These are not Church authority; no council has sat on them,—priests sometimes swear by them, and sometimes repudiate them.

The Irish Roman priesthood prepared an edition for the press, and then publicly renounced it, after publicly sanctioning it, and then privately printed it.

*The Dublin Review*, a Romanist periodical, condemned the Rhemish notes; the *London and Dublin Orthodox Journal*, also Romanist, defended these infamous notes, which were repudiated for a time by the Roman bishops, after commending and while printing them, for the purpose of evading Protestant indignation, and carrying a measure of toleration towards themselves; during which, they with policy denounced their intolerant and intolerable Rhemish Notes to the New Testament.\*

It is enough to state here that, whilst in Parliament, in examinations on oath, Roman bishops repudiated the notes to the Rhemish New Testament—notes which have the exact same authority as the translation itself: while these were being repudiated by authority, still in a Roman publication, also “by authority,” viz., the Right Rev. George Hays, “*SINCERE Christian Instructed*,” these very notes are quoted as a valid argument in favour of bigotry and intolerance!

So much for Roman translations and notes; *there is no Roman Church Bible; there are no Church notes in any language spoken by man.*†

Well, then, may the Roman priests say the laity have no right to the Bible, since the priests have no Bible to give them.

II. We propose to consider secondly, the reasons adduced by these Roman conspirators, or the principles on which they defend this silencing of the Holy Ghost, or making it speak in the jargon of priestcraft; and, setting aside *the image of God* in man, his conscience, and understanding, to serve God, not by the mutilations of bodies, and offering “the lame and blind” animals in sacrifice, but serving him with blind souls, mutilated faculties,—spoiling his gifts before we return them. First, destroying that “understanding given by the inspiration of the Almighty,” and then mocking God by the “*unreasonable service*” of body, soul, and spirit,—the body of an animal uninformed by understanding, the soul of a man denuded of conscience, the spirit of a man with the eyes of the understanding darkened—put out by the *unrelenting Hubert* of Roman jealousy and malice.

We shall confine our attention to the representations of one who is favourably regarded by many Protestants, and who has written directly upon this subject, Archbishop Fénelon in his letter on the use of the Bible.

The Bishop of Arras, being much troubled by the license people had taken to read the Scriptures, and the difficulty of carrying out the Church’s restrictions wrote to his Metropolitan Fénelon, for his views upon the subject.

The letter in reply is infamous throughout; but a few of its statements are pre-eminently so. The whole is written upon the supposition which Dean Milner maintains out of a father, that the heretics have no right to quote Scripture, which is the property of the Church, i.e., of the priests; bequeathed to them by the Apostles, though they do not quote the will; nor explain how the Apostles bequeathed the New Testament of Jesus Christ.

\* See “Complete Notes of the Douay Bible and Rhemish Testament,” &c. By the Rev. Robert J. McGhee, D.D. Simpkin and Marshall, London.

† Much additional material exists on this important argument, which will appear most probably in the first number of “THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE” for 1852.

He begins by stating "what cannot be called in question, that the laity were *wont to read the Bible in the first ages of the Church*" (p. 1); and that the Eastern Churches had the Bible in Greek. The Westerns had the "old italic" version; that thus "each possessed in their own language both the Bible and Liturgies," which "the very children were made to read." (p. 3.)

Yet he contradicts this, by adding that the Church was "careful not to intrust the sacred volume to the hands of those of whose faith and piety she was not satisfied." This is his own unauthorized addition, and is plainly untrue; else how could children be taught the Bible? Still, he proceeds, it must not be inferred, "that the Christian may not be solidly instructed in all the truths of religion, **ALTHOUGH HE HAS NEVER READ THE SCRIPTURES AT ALL.**" (p. 5.) This is printed in capitals, and is illustrated by barbarians who have received the gospel, whilst ignorant of letters, which does not seem a good reason for keeping them ignorant. But his logic is different. "Wherefore," as St. Irenæus observes, "it would be very erroneous to suppose that *the Church* cannot conduct *her children* to perfection, both in regard to faith and morals, *without the use or reading of the Bible.*" (p. 7.)

"Thus we see hermits themselves in their deserts sanctified by the fervour of their prayers, and *without any aid from the Scriptures*, arriving at the highest state of spiritual contemplation. We read even that one of *these holy recluses* went so far as to *sell the sacred volume*, by which he had been *instructed to 'SELL ALL,'* in order to give himself up entirely to the spirit of **EVANGELICAL poverty.**" (p. 7.)

This man was poor enough; but if he sold all, he sold Christ, though he had not Christ to sell; for it was from no aid of Christ's instructions that he sold the sacred volume, since there the man was told "to sell all that he *had*," and follow Christ; but he had not the gospels, so could not sell them; and if we follow Christ now, it must be in his word, where alone he is to be met with.

Thus do these ignorant bishops abuse God's word, and show their incapacity or deceitfulness.

Solomon says, "buy the truth and sell it not." This man sold the truth for evangelical poverty; and is admired by a Roman Metropolitan,—admired for that ignorance of Scripture on which the Roman Church vainly bases her claims to interpret it. Could they induce the world to imitate these ignorant and brutish recluses in their ecstasies of wool-gathering called spiritual meditations, soon men would be reduced to the level of these holy recluses, spiritual ignoramuses, who *derive no benefit* from God's word; but sell that jewel, for which Christ told us to sell all things. And thus, by rejecting the pearl of great price, attain to evangelical poverty.

"The faithful," continues our faithless Metropolitan, "may attain perfection without reading the Scriptures, since the **CHURCH**, which teaches them by the spirit of her divine spouse, *becomes to them a LIVING SCRIPTURE*; and a Scripture distributed among them in a way, of all others, best adapted and proportioned to their capacities and wants. It is under this feeling that St. Austin says, *attend to the Scriptures: WE ARE YOUR BOOKS. Intenti estote ad Scripturas oedices vestri sumus.* Men da,

indeed, read the Scriptures, when they listen to the voice of their pastors." (p. 7, 8.)

"Thus the pastors of the Church are in fact the real living Scriptures." (p. 8.) Of course, if this blasphemy be true, it is useless to quote that book written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost; for every priest is a walking Bible,—his word is the word of God, he is God to us.

"Wherefore," proceeds our Right Rev. deceiver, "behold what ought to be the conduct of the faithful whenever the *Church in her prudence* (policy?) should deem it necessary to restrict their liberty of reading the Bible, in order to impart to them a series of instructions *more accommodated and measured* to the nature of their wants." What are the faithful to do when the Church, in her prudence, sets aside and improves upon God's wisdom,—when she accuses the only wise God of incompetence to write a lesson book for his scholars? What, then, does the Roman Metropolitan advise? He says, "they ought on such occasions to *humble themselves*; and, on the ASSURANCES OF THE HOLY MOTHER, to believe that they sustain no loss." (p. 8, 9.)

What, then, has God condescended to speak by the mouth of all his holy prophets, and Apostles, and by his Son, in whom we are complete; and yet is it no loss to lose God's best gift to mankind? Then the Bible is a great mistake and impertinence; but if God's word can be dispensed with, the priests may be dispensed with; for they are lying knaves against God and for themselves.

Our Metropolitan of Roman priestcraft explains why the Church began in later times to restrict the Bible, namely, because men were getting to be heretics, that is, to follow God rather than man; and he quotes Popes and councils to prove the propriety of shutting God's book, except to licensed dupes.

*Their grand strength lies in the bell, book, and candle process*,—the altar excommunication, ringing a bell, shutting a book, and extinguishing a candle,—excommunicating God and man, saying they shall not speak to each other; putting out the light, man's reason; shutting the Bible, God's word; and ringing the bell, as the knell of human liberty and divine intelligence.

"For even the daily bread of life ought not," says our Metropolitan, "to be given to *children*, since it became now necessary to *break it for them*." (p. 11.) So the Church, as a great mother, would feed the world with the Papal pappoon! Are we, then, such *children*, and the priests such *men*?

Well then might Stanislaus in the pride of the Pontifical religion declare, that "a common priest, is as much better than a king, as a man is better than a beast; yea further, that as far as Almighty God doth excel a priest, so much doth a priest excel a king."

"Laymen," says another, (Gaspar Schioppus,) "are asses, mules, or horses; the Romanist, a *tame ass*; the heretic, a wild one. *Catholic kings are leading asses with bells*."—(p. 168. Miscellaneous works of John Jebb, M.D., &c. vol. iii.)

This witness speaks a severe truth; but we trust it will not last long, that the riders may yet be thrown; and the saddle abandoned for ever.

The Reformers "Wycliffe, Luther, and Calvin, and in fact all the *see*."

tarists of the sixteenth century, says our Metropolitan, reduced the Church to the necessity of restricting the public from the indiscriminate use of the Bible; and from the reading of it, without the permission of their pastors."—(p. 18.)

The French clergy, (our Metropolitan tells us,) in writing to Pope Alexander VII., "cite the words of St. Vincent, of Lerins, who says, that 'the Scripture, on account of the subtleties by which men turn its various texts against the authority of the Church,—is called THE BOOK OF HERETICS.'"—(p. 18.)

Yes! the Bible is our book; the Church is your book; God made our book; the priests made your book.

We need not travel much farther after the Metropolitan Fenelon, but simply observe, that he, like the rest of the Roman deceivers, brings infidel objections against the Bible; shewing that men will stumble at this and that; the case of David, and *some man* called Holofernes; that neither learned nor unlearned can understand these deep mysteries, therefore we are to shut the book, and obey the Church: otherwise men who are expected to swallow the miracles of the saints, will stumble at the miracles of the Bible: wherefore in conclusion, he advises a middle course—"to instruct the faithful well in the Scriptures, before they undertake to read them:" that is, to pre-occupy men's minds with priests' traditions, so that when they come to open the Scriptures, they may see in the sacred pages, only the figures of the priests' *magic lanthorn*. Or in the words of Fenelon, "so that when they do come to consult the sacred text, they may be already accustomed to understand it; and be filled with the *spirit* before they advance to the *letter*."—(p. 36.)

That is, be so filled with the spirit of delusion, as to shut out the spirit of God; for the Scriptures are not letter, as this priest in culpable ignorance supposes; the Old Testament was the letter that killeth; the New Testament is the spirit that giveth life; as our Lord himself declared, "the words that I speak unto you are, spirit and life"—but the priest says they are a dead letter,—which is true? Let God be true, though every priest should be found a liar.

"In short, says our Author, in capitals,—**THE SCRIPTURE SHOULD be given to THOSE ALONE, WHO, receiving them from the hands of the Church, seek in them only the SENSE OF THE CHURCH.**"—(p. 36)

This is making the Bible altogether a sham.

Has then God written a book, for us to find in it the sense of a Church, or a book in which the true Church will find the divine will—the mind of Christ?

III. We come then to the third point,—the refutation and exposure of these principles:—they expose themselves to all who have not been drugged from infancy by priests, or in manhood surrendered their senses, and shut their eyes for the priest to lead them by the hand. Solomon tells us, "a wise man's eyes are in his head;" the priests tell us, that the eyes of the faithful are in the priest's head. Then, perhaps, we may infer that the faithful are not wise.

But the votaries of Rome are deluded most of all by their priest's falsehood,—that we have not the right Bible; and, therefore, a few words here on that point.

We have seen what Bible they have—Jerome's Latin edition, the work not of the Church, but of a private man; therefore, not infallible by any Church standard. It was not done by a council, but only adopted by a council, and had before been adopted by many private persons; and if it became a true Bible by their adoption, they were sixteen hundred years without a true Bible.

And they have had several alterations of it, so have two only true Bibles; whilst they have not a single translation in the language of any living people; nor any notes in existence that have been passed by a Church council.

So that the Romanists are in this matter entirely at sea. Their English Douay Bible has mistranslated the Latin Bible in the case of *penance*, as everybody knows. Whilst their Latin version was altered after being made infallible—altered by learning and criticism of Cardinals.

But they stopped the science of criticism; whilst we have in our translation the results of increased learning, and the labour of many hands,—not one Jerome, but many learned men, with Jerome to help them; and we go to the originals, the Hebrew and the Greek, which Milner declares were not in the keeping of Rome. Therefore, we are not indebted to Rome for our Bible: we have gone to the fountain,—she has a polluted stream.

And her learned men acknowledge our translation is enough; for one, writing by authority, declares he will convince Protestants by "*clear words out of their own translation.*"

Nor do we object very greatly to their Douay Old Testament and Rheims New Testament; we object most to their binding the laity not to read with their own eyes, but with the eyes of the Church.

And here we may be allowed to explain, in few words, the different kinds of criticism to which a supposed revelation is properly subject. First, a moral criticism, whether its doctrines be holy or wicked; secondly, a comparison of its general style and purposes, as to whether any single passage is likely to have been a part of the original; thirdly, historical and literary criticism, the comparison of editions and manuscripts.

Now, the Protestant translations were made at a time when true criticism had advanced; it was in connexion with what has been called the revival of learning, that Protestantism arose,—when Greek literature had come to light. Now the New Testament was written in Greek, and the Old Testament was very early translated into Greek, which translation our Lord and his Apostles used; therefore, when all this came out, the truths of Christianity were made more plain, and this is our advantage over Roman authorities.

Dr. Newman himself shall explain it all, and place Protestantism on the pinnacle of learning.

"And now I will mention a distinct vehicle of the Protestant tradition in England, which was an instance of good fortune, greater than its originators could possibly have anticipated or contrived. Protestantism became, not only the tradition of law and of good society, but the tradition of literature also. There is no English literature before the age of Elizabeth; but with the latter years of her reign begins that succession of great authors which continues to flow on down to this day. *So it was that about the commencement of the sixteenth century learning revived; an*

*the taking of Constantinople by the Turks the men of letters of the imperial city, and, what was of more consequence, its libraries, became the property of the West.* Schools were opened for the cultivation of studies and pursuits, which make Greece as renowned among the nations in the gifts of intellect, as Judea has been in the gifts of grace. THE VARIOUS PERFECTIONS OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE, *the treasures of Greek thought; the genius and taste of Greek art, after the sleep of ages, burst upon the European mind. It was like the warmth, the cheerfulness, and the hues of spring succeeding to the pure and sublime, but FANTASTIC FORMS OF WINTER FROSTWORK.* The barbarism, the sternness, the untowardness of the high and noble mediæval school, *eyed with astonishment, and melted beneath the radiance of a genius unrivalled in the intellectual firmament.* A world of ideas, transcendent in beauty and endless in fertility, flooded the imagination of the scholar and the poet. The fine arts underwent a classical development, and the vernacular tongues caught the refinement and the elegance of the age of Pericles and Alexander. The revival began in Catholic Italy; it advanced into Catholic France; at length it *showed itself in Protestant England. A voice came forth from the graves of the old world, as articulate and keen as that of a living teacher; and it thrilled into the heart of the people to whom it came, and it taught them. to respond to it in their own tongue, and THAT TEACHING WAS COINCIDENT WITH THE FIRST PREACHING OF PROTESTANTISM.* It was surely *a most lucky accident for the young religion that, while the English language was coming to the birth with its special attributes of nerve, simplicity, and vigour, at its very first breathings Protestantism was at hand to form it upon its own theological patois, and to educate it as the mouth-piece of its tradition.* So, however, it was to be; and soon,

‘As in this bad world below  
Noblest things find vilest using;’

*the new religion employed the new language for its purposes, in a GREAT UNDERTAKING, THE TRANSLATION OF ITS OWN BIBLE; a work which, by the purity of its diction, and the strength and harmony of its style, has deservedly become the very model of good English, and the standard of the language to all future times.* The same age which saw this GREAT LITERARY ACHIEVEMENT, gave birth to some of the greatest masters of thought and composition in the most various departments of authorship. Shakespeare, Spenser, Sidney, Raleigh, Bacon, and Hooker, are its own; and they were, withal, more or less the panegyrists of Elizabeth and *her religion*, and, moreover, at least the majority of them, adherents of her creed, because already clients of her throne.” (p. 65, 66.)

Do we need a greater tribute than this? Protestantism arose with the light of learning and the Greek Scriptures; and then, in the full blast of this learning, our translation was made. Then, with the resurrection of Greek letters, with which Christianity was entombed, Christ arose from the dead, accompanied with a galaxy of human genius; then the grotesque forms of Roman frostwork melted away; and they will have to hide that sun again to renew the frost. It has gone for ever: the time of the singing birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land. Priests must roll back the tide of intelligence, bury again the monuments of human learning and divine truth, before they can introduce the

dreary reign of their hoary and icebound winter of thought into this favoured isle, and the Christian world at large.

But we have not space for this minuteness of criticism, and must therefore seize upon the grand points of this important subject.

The difficulties of Scripture are paraded before us, when we speak of men judging: but unfortunately Scripture is plain when they would prove their Church; "hear the Church," say they, and "this is my body,"—plain literal words appealing to our common sense; and then having taken our sense captive, immediately the word is very difficult, and common sense is set aside; thus do they throw down the bridge of reason and judgment, over which they have led us, in order that we may never return.

The Scripture is plain when it points to the Church, the Scripture is difficult when the Church begins to interpret.—(True enough!)

So the clear and simple Scripture proves the authority of the priest, and then the priest proves that Scripture is not clear, our reason is good till we get to Rome, *and then we are imbecile*: undoubtedly! reason is rated to tell us, that the Church alone has reason, and that we have none at all: our understandings are sufficient to convince us that all but priests are idiots.

Thus by the help of the Bible and private judgment, they prove the worthlessness of the Bible and the folly of judging.

Yet if human judgment be so worthless, the priests are only men, or hardly that, so their judgment is no better.

He that trusteth to his own heart is a fool, the Scriptures declare, and the priests quote it; we reply, he is a greater fool who trusts to the heart of another; but he is a wise man who trusts to the heart of Jesus.

The oral teaching of the Apostles, was sufficient, but the Church is not the Apostles; we can now attend only to their *writings*.

We do not repudiate the help of teachers, we hail commentators and preachers, and all helps, but we repudiate all authority: the word is enough to furnish teachers, and call them forth to their work.

In sciences and all learning, masters and dictionaries, and lectures, are allowed, but this is not an infallible standard, *each one judges of the help he uses*; and so it is in religion. True, there are points which perhaps none can clear up, and Rome cannot help that, still the points of salvation are as plain as daylight, plainer than transubstantiation,—that whosoever believeth in him, might not perish but have everlasting life.

Dr. Milner quibbles about historical and critical questions, which he says the vulgar cannot understand: and in reply to the observation, that these things are not essential, he asks—"how *we* can distinguish in God's word, what part is to be left as not essential to salvation?" Certainly we can be saved without understanding all the hard names in the tenth of Nehemiah, or deciding on the size and plan of the ark; for the Bible itself tells us, which parts are essential; the Levitical law is for the Jews; the Christian law is for us;—believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved. Moses and Elias are taken away, and God *says*, *this is my beloved Son, hear him*; and we see no man save Jesus only; so God himself has passed by all other characters, *and with his finger pointed out the Saviour, saying, ye are COMPLETE IN HIM*; and are justified from



all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses. Thus hath the Father distinguished the Son, and himself taught us what part is essential.

Therefore the choice is easy and our duty is plain; for whilst the priest says,—half-quoting and misapplying Scripture—"hear the Church," and build on Popes; Christ says, he that heareth my words and doeth them, buildeth on a rock; and all else, such as the Pope, is sand.

The whole gospel is built on the principle of private judgment, and individual responsibility to God: the priest says hear us, we have to answer for you: Paul says, so then every one must give an account of himself to God.

The Redeemer preached not to the learned, who opposed him, but to the *common people who heard him gladly, whilst PRIESTS CRUCIFIED him.*

Philip said, *understandest thou what thou readest*, and the Eunuch required a teacher, because *the Holy Ghost was not yet given to him*; and he had read *only Moses*, and Philip took care that he should *understand, by explaining the book and preaching Christ from the writings of the prophets.* The Spirit led the Apostles into all the truth about Jesus, and we have all that truth in our hand; *every man may have in his house, A TRUE CANONICAL COUNCIL, Christ and his twelve Apostles*, and may learn all they have to teach, and despise all intermeddling priests, for God hath shewed it unto us.

St. Paul *reasoned* with men out of the *Scriptures*, and commended the Bereans as more noble, that is, more heretical than those of Thessalonica, which is Rome: and because they *searched the Scriptures, THEREFORE many of them believed.*

Our Lord commanded men to search the Scriptures, the priest says they cannot understand them; our Lord said, why even of your own selves do ye not judge what is right, the priest says it is impossible, and judgment is blasphemy. Thus have they set aside the word of God, by their traditions. Christ says, he that hath ears to hear, let him hear; the priest says, our ears are useless; Christ says, their eyes they have closed lest they should see; the priest says, they *should* close their eyes, and have no right to open them.

Christ says, "let him that *readeth, understand*"; the priest says, they need not read, and cannot understand.

Christ sent Paul, that the eyes of men's understandings might be enlightened; the Pope sends priests that the eyes of their understandings may be darkened; Christ turns men from darkness to light; the Pope turns men from light to darkness.

The priests are thieves and robbers, who have claimed all the promises made to the *Church*, that is, to the PEOPLE of God to themselves.

They parade their learning and ask, what can the laity know?—Christ says, I thank thee O Father that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them *unto babes*; even so Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight. The priests say, Christ is with them, and they are the channel of the Holy Ghost: Christ says, if a man (*i. e.* layman, any one) love me and my words, I will come to him: and *my word* (not the priest's wafer) shall be in him a well of water springing:

up unto everlasting life. The priests say the Holy Ghost is with councils, and Christ presides there: Christ says, wherever two or three laity meet in my name there am I. The priests say they have the Spirit: Christ says, our heavenly Father giveth his Holy Spirit to any that ask him.

The priests say, let the unlearned and unwise come to us: the Apostle says, if any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not.

The priests say the priests are the Church: God says the people are the Church, and the people are the priests as well; ye laity are a holy nation, a royal priesthood; and they shall be my people, and I will dwell in them; ye (laity) are builded together into a holy temple in the Lord for a habitation of God by his spirit. And a priest shall not say, know the Lord, for all shall know me—wise and simple—without priestly infallibility, for the knowledge of the Lord shall be common as daylight; general, as the waters cover the sea: the priests say, the people are to obey them; the Apostle says, try the spirits (the priests) whether they be of God; for though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel than is here in the epistles, let him be anathema, and what Paul binds on earth, Christ will bind in heaven.

The priests say, Christianity is dark: Christ, the centre of Christianity, says he is the light of the world.

Christ is the true light, that is, the sun. Wiseman lights candles, as a sign that this sun has not risen on him; and by these candles they would light the laity. But he is the true light who, coming into the world *enlighteneth every man*. Isaiah says, to the law and the testimony: the priests say, to the Church and the Pope. What, then, shall we say of this vast system of delusion?

It exposes its abettors to that threat of the Apostle,—take heed what ye build on this foundation; for if any man build wood, hay, straw, or stubble, the *fire shall try every man's work*. This is the passage on which the priests found purgatory, and *the purgatory belongs to THEM*; it is the work of the *teacher* that is thus to be tried; but as the priests, in their avarice for power, claim to themselves the promises that belong to the people, so they transfer to the people the threatenings that belong to faithless perverters of God's word and man's conscience. This threatening of trial by fire is for false priests, who build on Paul's foundation, viz., Jesus Christ, their own false doctrines: these priests are to go to this purgatory.

And now, in conclusion, if any think that in these inquiries we have used lightness of wit and satire, let them consider the monstrous absurdities, as well as deep spiritual wickedness, with which we have had to deal. Wit has not been employed to evade a difficulty, but only to point an argument, even burlesque, and the *trials* of Sham Peter and Church never forgot logic; nor are we ever more serious than when seemingly in jest on such momentous subjects. This way of putting things both relieves attention, which has been required in this instance; and is the feather on the arrow, that it may fly swift and sure to the true aim, the understandings and conscience of men.

The ancient thyrsus was a spear-head, hidden in a wreath of ivy and vine leaves; and this method we have resorted to, to give effect to in-

straction, whilst we have not shunned to appeal to the true armoury of that word which is quick and powerful,—sharper than any two-edged sword.

God made man in his own image, that is, to have dominion; but he sunk under the slavery of sin and priestcraft: so that all things were not put under him; but we see Jesus, made after man's original, to lift man from under his slavery and degradation, that as he rises with Christ, all things may be under his feet. But the priests come to rob man of dignity and dominion, and frustrate the work of the Redeemer by hindering the emancipation of mankind; and they come with falsehood, in the name of that Peter who said, stand up, I am only a man; and they say, lie down; you are only slaves, and we are your masters.

To preserve their rule, they have reversed that saying, "the Word of God is not bound," for they have chained it to the chair of Peter, and made both Christ and his followers children. For, as in the cathedral in this town, we have a device of the Madonna and child, with St. George killing the dragon, so have they ever kept the Saviour in childhood, in his mother's arms, wrapped in swaddling-clothes, and presented these to the people; whilst the saints, and not Christ, have killed their dragons, forgetful that Christ left his mother's arms, where they ever paint him, and has ascended to his Father's throne, to rule over his own freed men!

### NOVELS: ARE THEY BENEFICIAL OR INJURIOUS TO SOCIETY?

IN attempting to sustain the affirmation that novels, upon the whole, are rather injurious to society than otherwise, our greatest difficulty will be to make the shadow we oppose take some palpable shape, that you may perceive our adversary, and become spectators of the strife.

What, then, *are* Novels? Some are anxious to include under this title the whole range of fictitious literature, and so sail triumphantly under false colours. But we conceive there is a great deal of glorious fiction, constituting the wittiest and sublimest creations of the intellect, which does not come under this denomination. We do not call satires, plays in general—whether tragedy or comedy—Novels (though some Novels may be dramatized); nor do we consider Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress," or the "Parables of the Bible," or Milton's "Paradise Lost and Regained," to be Novels; some may, perhaps, be inclined to call these, and others like them, *religious novels*; but this seems to us a strange combination of words. The term novel, in its general use, is *peculiarly sacred to secular purposes*.

Novels, then, form a peculiar class of fictitious literature; they are a modern form into which exuberant fancy has shaped herself. The exact meaning of the word is learnt better from an acquaintance with books than from any definition. If we were asked why "Robinson Crusoe" is not a novel, we should scarcely be able to decide whether it really be one, or, if not, in what respect it falls short: perhaps it wants some catastrophe, that shall result from man's ambition, or from woman's love; but

it chiefly fails in the latter element, which we all know is nearly as essential for the due progress of novel events as for the real happiness of human life. Though, on consideration, this is to masculine an idea, for whilst no orthodox young man would read a novel in which there was no heroine, there is the same reason to suppose that the ladies would equally resent the absence of the hero. We must, however, admit that we are at a loss for a definition, and can only say, that by a novel, we mean what people generally mean by the same term; and that for any further explanation we must refer to the cases where the word is used. *Nor is this difficulty more in the way of those who oppose, than of those who defend, these books.* For if we are said not to know what we attack, *they are equally ignorant as to what they support.*

But it will not be pretended, that we can have no discussion, nor lay down any principle where a definition is impossible, for in the majority of practical cases a definition would be out of the question.

In all cases of "imperfect rights," there is this difficulty; but though we cannot tell to a scruple how much gratitude is becoming in certain cases, we can insist on its propriety, and censure its absence. Although there may be no laws to enforce generosity and courtesy, yet we may reason clearly about these things; and, indeed, we very often understand better those things which cannot be defined, than those which can. But who can say with the proverbial precision of an Act of Parliament what a *heap* is? And yet a man may be indicted for a nuisance, if he lay a heap at your door. *On the same ground we indict these Novel-mongers.* Nor shall we be turned aside from our sacred duty by any demands for definition, even though they should show demonstratively, that because you cannot name the genus and *differentiæ*,—that between them include and distinguish palaces and cottages,—*that, therefore, a peasant is a king.* If, however, gentlemen still insist on this preliminary, we invite them to look carefully at the subject of imperfect rights, and try the metal of their weapons on that shield.

We will not stay to ask for a definition of fictitious literature, or it would readily appear that even this is not very definite, since fiction must mingle largely with fact, even in real history; for the historian who has the readiest fancy always gives the most vivid portrait; but we proceed at once to the main question: are Novels beneficial or injurious to Society?

There is one great mistake to which the advocates of novels are liable, in common with the advocates for the stage, namely, choosing the one great name of unquestioned lustre and worth, to decide the whole inquiry. You would think in the case of the theatres, that the *influence of the stage meant the influence of Shakspeare*; whereas everybody knows that he is, comparatively, seldom acted; the stage requires grosser allurements. Shakspeare is too pure and too lofty for the generality of play-goers; an obscene dance would out-vote him any night. So with novels; one would think the influence of novels means the influence of Scott. But how many more are they who deal in the daintier productions of this modern intellectual froth!

Shakspeare and Scott are unique examples; to compare them with others, is like Tityrus comparing Rome with his own village. This, however, Tityrus confesses to be a misapprehension: the things differ not only in *size*, but in *species*.

"Sic parvis componere magna solebam,  
 Verum hæc tantum alias inter caput estulit urbes,  
 Quantum lenta solent, inter viburna cupressi."

Thus I used to compare great things with small; but this has lifted up her head among other cities, as much as *cypresses* do among *shrubs*.

The statue of Sir Walter, in George's Square, Glasgow, looks over the world: sic omnes inter, caput estulit. There is no comparison.

There is another mistake, by removing which, we may materially elucidate this question. It is not sufficient to prove that a well cultivated and properly regulated mind may choose the best kind of novels, and read them *moderately* with delight and profit. This is quite possible. But we have to decide not about the influence of these things on those who know how to choose the quality, and are able to regulate the quantity, but the general influence of this branch of literature on society. The more knowing and virtuous may possibly pick their way with caution, and escape without much danger; but we must also consider those who have not these defences. There are those who have not this discrimination and self-restraint. What, then, shall we say is the natural result of these being turned promiscuously into such dangerous and flowery paths?—where pleasure presents herself as a naked *Venus*, and appeals at once to those passions and desires which are sufficiently powerful in all; but which in the young and uncurbed, appear almost irresistible.

In stating the specific objections to which novels are liable, there is some difficulty in classifying them under a few perspicuous topics. We shall, however, endeavour to arrange them under three. And, first, which is the common and obvious objection, they tend to give erroneous views of life in general, and of certain vices in particular. Any violation of the established moralities of society is too often veiled under the splendour of the character committing it. They do not show vice her own image; but make profligates and seducers, or unscrupulously ambitious men, admirable in many other respects: so that their virtues serve no other end than as garlands to adorn their vices. Then, as to life in general, they give, as we say, erroneous views of it,—make it an aerial castle; place its events out of the ordinary course of cause and effect: they teach to form splendid expectations on no solid grounds, and fill the minds of the young and giddy with anticipations of noble mansions,—perhaps of glittering palaces,—instead of what may be nearer their real condition—a humble cottage. They present beautiful topics of conversation amongst young ladies and gentlemen as to the *loves of straw*, and fortunes of fancy, that these novels have suggested; and in every ball-room they look round for the hero or heroine, with whose imaginary career they will connect their own. The main feature is an exaltation of fancy,—joining ends without means, teaching the providence of chance, exhibiting the lucky turns on the wheel of fortune, making successes only so many prizes in a lottery, to be expected on the same principle as affluence by gambling,—transforming the whole active and responsible business of life into the art of dreaming.

But, secondly, the best novels, in common with the worst, debilitates the intellect; whilst, thirdly, a great many, and those the most popular, pollute the heart.

We say, in the second place, that even the best pre-eminently, debilitate the intellect—enervate, enfeeble the mind. The more splendid and fascinating a novel is, the more it relaxes all mental vigour, and binds with the silken bonds of indolence. This is a serious charge in a world where there is so much real business to be attended to.

In general, the writers of these books present you with a repository of small-talk, and weaken the digestive powers by the thinness of the aliment.

*"Nos convivia, nos proelia virginum  
Strictis in juvenes unguibus acutum,  
Cantamus vacui, sive quid vivimur,  
Non præter solitum leves."*

But all this is done with a winning grace, and herein lies the mischief; if the poison were not luscious, it would not be taken. Novels not only place trifles in the way of real business, but they unfit the mind for anything but trifling. We are luxuriously idle,—must stretch our limbs at the head of some sweet rill, beneath an Italian sky.

*"Nec partem solido demere de die,  
Spernit, nunc vividi membra sub arbuto  
Stratus, nunc, ad aquæ læne caput sacræ."*

Let any one try, after the relaxation of a novel, to perform some earnest business, and he will not only be disinclined to it, but, to a great extent disabled. And if we consider how many persons there are who have but little time to read books, that are at once entertaining and instructive,—that relieve the tedium of life, without emasculating the mind by a dangerous pleasure,—it will be evident how great an evil these fascinating novels must exert over those who have too many important things to learn, to be able to afford this wanton dalliance. To suppose that novels are the only relaxation by which men may forget the toil of the muscle or the brain, is nearly as wise as to suppose that the only physical relaxation we can enjoy, is to be steeped frequently in a warm bath.

Repose is the only luxury that novels afford; they allow the mind to lie down, and watch imagination amusing herself with a magic lanthorn; but even this reclining become wearisome, and all active effort still more dreadful. This is not a healthy mountain sport, where the whole frame is invigorated by the freshening breezes; but we are cooped up in a snug warm parlour, or luxuriantly lolling in the easy chair of our study, nicely warmed, the air quite odoriferous, we ourselves poured over with liquid odours, till all manly enterprize becomes feared as perdition. This is too inglorious a repose for the true hero, who is preparing for the rough campaign of the world; the rest itself becomes laborious, the rose-bed gives no delight to the satiated senses,—and a doubled rose-leaf becomes the source of more exquisite agony than would naturally be experienced in the real calamities of life. An unnatural craving for excitement is produced by the very best novels; they unfit for solid reflection; they make life one long vacation; and when we turn to active business, we are sickened, as if opening our school-books in the middle of a holiday;—it is like studying logic in a college vacation.

This, then, is our reason for concluding against novels, namely, that

they relieve the *ennui* of life, by rendering plain life tedious, and by creating a disgust at reality and exertion.

It is the fascinating opium of the intellect, shrivelling the faculties, and chaining the mind—a hopeless prisoner in the “Castle of Indolence.”

We come, in the third place, to consider the influence of novels upon the morality of their readers. We assert, then, that not only do even the best tend to enervate the mind, but a great number, and those the most widely read, too frequently pollute the heart. And here, we would observe, as a general principle, that whatever weakens the mind, unstringing the faculties for their proper duties, must have a bad moral effect. Our previous argument, therefore, about the intellect so far, strengthens our position respecting the heart.

Also, whatever gives wrong views of life in general, and makes chance, rather than honest exertion, to be depended on, must so far have a similar effect. Novels are also morally injurious, either from inculcating wrong principles insidiously, or from open obscenity—direct and palpable vice. We charge the former of these upon a great many novels; but shall confine our remarks and illustrations chiefly to the latter.

“ See here be all the pleasures,  
That fancy can beget on youthful thoughts.”

Here is the true Circean cup—

“ Who knows not Circe,  
The daughter of the sun, whose charmed cup  
Whoever tasted, lost his upright shape,  
And downward fell, into a grovelling swine ?”

Or her son Comus

“ Offering to every weary traveller  
His orient liquor in a crystal glass,  
To quench the drouth of Phoebus, which as they taste,—  
(For most do taste, through fond ‘ intemperate thirst’),  
Soon as the potion works their human countenance,—  
The express resemblance of the gods is changed  
Into some brutish form,———  
And they, so perfect is their misery,  
Not once perceive their foul disfigurement.”

Doubtless, novels introduce young persons into the school of the world, enable young elegant misses to use the superlative degree, shape lively girls into Fanny Wildings, teach saloon life, gild vice, and allure to its destruction. They form eligible cookery-books for young housewives; present youthful mariners with a guide to Charybdis; and so should be honoured and advocated by all moralists.

We will take a specimen, not it is true of novels, as many of them are now-a-days; but a classic; one that has not only delicate incidents sufficiently pointed to suit the hour, like the fungus productions, whose birth and death are perennial, but one whose intellectual merit, has given permanency to its moral blemishes. We mean good Mr. Sterne’s “Tristram Shandy:” on which, however, very particular comment is dangerous.

How delicately the Autobiography commences! then the birth;—Dr. Slop and the Midwife, &c., together with the expressive dash, and its frequent repetition, as being such a capital thing: the catastrophe of —\* helped out by asterisks, as if in all impure passages, the writer’s wit

wanted pointing; and depended more on the printer's devil, than on his own good genius: the wound of Uncle Toby, &c.—the whole concluding with reflections, on the lamentable fact that "*passion bends down the faculties*;"—though the entire book is written on the hypothesis that the greatest patriot is a rake:—that the loftiest, nay the exclusive duty of man is, the preservation of his species; nothing is said without a view to posterity;—the very science of fortification and war, is turned into an equivoque to fortify impudence and storm the castle of modesty. Amidst all this, is a *sermon on conscience*; interspersed with pious interjections, and followed by an easy lesson on blasphemy:—what a dear little casket of sensibility, worthily dedicated to an ass; in confirmation of the adage,

"Fellow feeling makes us wondrous kind."

We will say nothing about the sentimental journey, but will let our Author criticise himself. "Maria looked wistfully for some time at me; and then at her goat, and then at me; and then at her goat again; and so on alternately. Well, Maria, said I, softly, *what resemblance do you find?*"

Now here is a standard novel, excelling many in taste; uniting the blandishments of intellect, to leave upon the soul the impress of an odious and contemptible sensuality.

We know there are better books, belonging to this class,—and that this is the natural answer. But Shore comes at last to Shoreditch. Is Smollet any better?—or Fielding, or Swift? Now these are standards; appreciated by the critics;—read by the directors of opinion and morals;—the picked novels for educated men; who have a nicer appreciation: but poorer mortals must imitate them at a distance—for how can those who are led, keep side by side with, or precede their leaders?

What then are the majority of novel authors;—that herd of "*lewd fellows of the baser sort*," who feed the taste of the plebeian novel community? Why, truly, they belong to one of two classes; or partly share in both;—they are either trash or impurity; or a mixture of these two. Either, thin mamby pamby; "*milk for babes*;" or have a relieving dash of indecency, as a rest to the languid appetite of the reader. We know there are decent novels; but the very best, are as we have shown, only a soporific to the intellect; whilst a great many, and those the most thumbed by your circulating library students, instead of having wit enough to redeem their impudence;—offering as an apology for being a great nuisance, that the author was a great genius;—that God had blessed him with high faculties; that he is not a clownish brute, but an aristocratic well-educated pimp; whose sins are all gentlemanly; who shews the "*way to the pit*," with a winning grace;—those most thumbed we say have no such handsome apology;—the really cherished novel, which the gambling parson locks in his desk; the sweetly blushing maiden lays under her pillow—"*squat like a toad, just at the ear of eve*"—or which the kitchen scullion hides under the dusters;—these all appeal to human nature as it is, and scorn to cover their nakedness by Sterne's overarching wit, and inimitable grace.



## REVIEWS AND CRITICISMS.

---

*Lectures on the Attributes of the Divine Being. By the Rev. Thomas Swan B. L. Green, London.*

The Author of this book is well known as the Pastor of Cannon Street Chapel, Birmingham. The Lectures were delivered to his own congregation, by whom they were well received. They are now published in hope that the important truths may have a corresponding influence through a wider circle. The contents are as follows :—

“The Being, Unity, Spirituality, Infinity, Eternity, Immutability of God, including the Divine faithfulness, omniscience, omnipotence, holiness, justice, goodness, and incomparableness of the Divine Being.”

Every real thinker will see with a glance that these subjects are equal to the best efforts of the most profound theologian and metaphysician combined. Mr. Swan has not attempted either the profound or refined, but he has, we think, succeeded in presenting his thoughts so as to be understood, and consequently valued by the greatest number of serious enquiring minds.

The following observations in the Lecture on omniscience are impressive :—“Wicked men may conceal their dark deeds from their fellow creatures, and exhibit a shining external appearance, like whitened sepulchres, beautiful outwardly, the eye of omniscience they cannot elude, nor in any way deceive him who knows exactly what we are, and forms the true estimate of our character ; we may deceive ourselves and others, but we cannot impose on him. Oh, should not this solemn thought impress us, and deeply affect our minds ; and more especially those who live in secret sin, and whose only solicitude is that they may elude the observation of men ; should they not reflect, that the omniscient one is ever near them, and marking all their secret ways and hidden movements with rigid, piercing scrutiny ? And why should they continue in sin, as if there were no God, or as if he were altogether such a one as themselves, as if he did not see them ? As if what is written in the divine word were not true, that there is no darkness nor shadow of death, where the workers of iniquity may hide themselves.”

Again, in the eleventh Lecture, we have as follows :—“To him, all who desire lasting good must repair, nor shall they be disappointed, nor sent empty away. In the preaching, of the gospel, the blessings of his good are presented to all, and through faith in Christ they may be obtained in this way, alone receiving Christ as a Saviour, trusting in him, obeying him, and following him, may become interested in his goodness.

“And why should not all do so ? Can you be happy in any other way ? Is not your condition as sinners such, that without this goodness you must perish ? And is it not the very thing you want, the good without which you are miserable, which is adapted to your souls, which alone can satisfy them, and which shall endure for ever, which like God himself is immutable and everlasting ; oh, continue it not ; despise not the riches of his goodness and forbearance, which lead to repentance—to that repentance not to be repented of, to that Godly sorrow which is unto salvation.”

If we are not mistaken, the following extract will induce some of our readers to desire the book. After speaking of the importance of storing the memory with interesting and important facts, the Author says, that by a slight effort of this faculty will recall to our aid thousands of instructive companions. To this are we indebted for many of our sweetest pleasures ; and it should be our aim through life, that our recollections may be all virtuous and holy, that memory may be a friend, that she may be adorned with the beauties of holiness, and that she may resemble a paradise stored with richest sweets, and filled with loveliest scenes, ever blooming, fragrant, and fruitful, to which we may repair at pleasure.”

We wish it an extensive circulation.

I.

## CHRIST'S RELIGION.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD." 1 Thess. v. 12.

---

### THE TRUE APOSTLES' CREED;

OR THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON OF LIFE AND DOCTRINE;—  
TRUTH IN JESUS.

*(Concluded from page 438.)*

THE Canon or rule and test of Christian doctrine and the Christian life, exhibited in the character and history of the Redeemer, appears to us something like an important discovery in the mine of truth provided in the Scriptures; and we are greatly mistaken if the articles devoted to this subject, will not amply repay the most attentive and serious perusal, and afford a very obvious and simple directory in the search after truth.

We have endeavoured to establish the reality of this rule, as a Scriptural Canon, that "truth is in Jesus;" whilst the peculiarity, and the fitness (as a popular guide) as well the sufficiency of this rule (as excluding or invalidating all other standards) have been clearly indicated.

We have further intimated the important principles, that as all Christian truth is exemplified in the Saviour, so any doctrines even included in the gospel, cease to be Christian truths when taught apart from their relation to Christ; and moral duties insisted on or performed without regard to the authority of the Saviour and our obligations to him, form no part of Christian morality.

Having advanced thus far safely, with regard to our rule of religious opinions and conduct, we proceeded to apply the rule itself, and estimated the truths it contained; these were classified as of three kinds:—

1. Truths respecting the divine character and will, in the person and mission of the Saviour.

2. The true emblem of man's condition, duties and hopes, as illustrated in the life, death, and ascension of the Redeemer.

3. The true method by which these duties can be fulfilled, and these hopes attained, as afforded in the same illustrious character.

Thus we have a threefold series of truths, in one person, a representative of divinity, in its relations to mankind; a representative of humanity, in its actual and possible conditions; and the means by which the possible exaltation of humanity may be secured: we have therefore to "*learn Christ*" in his divine capacity, in his example for us, and as a means for our attaining to this model, in holiness here, and in glory hereafter.

We have inquired into the first class of truths here indicated,—the

standard for our thoughts respecting the character of the "invisible God," in his visible image, "the brightness of the Father's glory," the effulgence with which God "hath in these last days" beamed upon us in the person of the Redeemer; that we may behold here the moral image of that being whose natural image (even his eternal power and godhead) is seen in outward creation. There is no room then left for doubt, as to the direction in which we are to search for the divine character, "for he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father."

2. We are now prepared to examine the second class of truths embodied in the Redeemer, namely, TRUTHS RESPECTING MAN, the exact account of our spiritual condition and prospects.

In this rule regarding human nature, the following elements are discoverable.

(1) The true index to man's suffering and degenerate condition.

(2) An exhibition of the true perfection of man's nature, after God's moral image, in righteousness and true holiness.

(3) We find the truth respecting man's possible future condition opened to him (through the door of the Saviour's grave) into the glory of the eternal world.

The first is man's spiritual death and bodily mortality; the second is man's spiritual resurrection; the third is the resurrection of his body, and transfiguration of his entire nature. These are the three truths respecting man, displayed in our Saviour and representative.

(1) "We see Jesus," then, in the first place, as the emblem and illustration of man's suffering and degenerate condition, the sin and mortality of our race. *He represents our sin, not by sharing in it, but by suffering for it.* "In him was no sin;" but the very contrast made our sin evident, as "he who knew no sin was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

In the treatment and entire history of the Redeemer on earth, we discover the traces and indications of the sins of the world; whilst the nature of his mission into this world, to take away its sins, is a sufficient proof of man's degenerate condition. If men had been perfect, they would have needed no such redemption, knowing God in the Spirit, he would not have been manifest in the flesh. This visit of Jehovah to his estranged children, the approach of God in mercy to his rebel subjects, is a plain lesson respecting the moral state of mankind. Accordingly, the Apostle Paul declares, respecting the purpose of the Saviour's mission to this world, that he "*was delivered for OUR OFFENCES*, and was raised again for our justification."

"Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. But God commended his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."—(Rom. v. 1, 2, 6, 8, 21.)

"For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God. Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ

Jesus. Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God. To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.”—(Rom. iii. 23—26.)

The purpose, therefore, for which Christ came, implies the sinful state of the world, and, consequently, the truth of man's moral condition is intimated in the Saviour's work—to pardon and destroy sin. Whilst the conduct of Christ, in going about doing good, and healing all manner of sicknesses and diseases, intimates both the merciful object of the Redeemer, and the suffering condition of the world; especially when we remember that these bodily diseases and their removal, served to *typify our spiritual maladies and their cure* by the great physician of souls.

For as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness to heal men's bodies, and foreshadow the Redeemer, so Christ removed our sickness to embody in miracles the types of his spiritual benefits; offering a world-wide cure for a world-wide disease.

Besides, the purpose of his coming and his conduct while here, we find in his history another proof of man's degenerate state, from the *treatment* which the Saviour endured: he was hated for telling the truth, because that truth was against men's passions, prejudice, and immediate interests.

The same conduct is still exhibited amongst men, so that he who speaks most truth shall have the most enemies; that is, if he speak not the truths which are nominally received, but the truths which are least popular and most required; that strike at public errors and sins, that aim a blow at gilded injustice or respectable forms of iniquity and delusion.

In this is most strikingly displayed the sinfulness of men in their hatred of such truth as is need, truths that tend to reform upon established doctrines and conduct. The sin of men in this respect, as hating the Saviour for the truth which he declared, is asserted by our Lord himself.

“If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. Remember the word that I said unto you,—the servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep your's also. But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not him that sent me. If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin. He that hateth me, hateth my Father also. If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin; but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father.”—(John xv. 18—24.)

This reception was left as a legacy to the followers of Christ, who is hated over again in the person and teaching of his followers: “I have given them thy truth, and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.”

Thus, in the history of Christ, do we find reflected the sin of man; whilst the general evils of human life, weariness, poverty, desertion, and

death, fell also to his lot, as the illustration of human sufferings; so that we see in him, as in a mirror, the whole of human life: he shared in its miseries, and was the victim of its sins; respecting iniquity, he was truly a mirror, exhibiting and reflecting man's character without sharing in our sins, *as a glass reflects any object, however debasing, without itself being stained by the evil it represents.*

And still the same process is repeated, as Christ is again persecuted and rejected; persecuted in the contempt, obstruction, and suffering endured by those who are valiant for his truth; rejected by those who having his glory unveiled, seeing Jesus transfigured beyond what the life-companions of his personal ministry ever beheld, still submit not their hopes and principles to his sceptre of mercy!

(2) The truth in Jesus respecting man consists, secondly, of *man's real perfection*—the true model of his renewed nature.

In other words, the life of Christ, in all the principles he displayed, is our model. Hence the new man is a *Christian*; that is a follower of Christ. His life is a line stretched out across ours, and we are to be true to it, "as the truth is in Jesus." The first fact respecting man, embodied in the mission and life of Jesus is, that men are sinners; the second fact in Christ's life about men is, a *model for saints*: the true saintship is, not to be canonized, and have your name in a calendar, but rather to be anathematized as a heretic, and to have your name in the list of forbidden books; this is a fair likelihood of being in the Lamb's book of life. Church saints have been sorry characters—owls in the sunshine. The true saint is the true Christian, who is true by the rule as in the spirit and example of Jesus.

This is the immediate argument of Paul in the immediate connexion of the words, "the truth is in Jesus," as our practical rule,—the holiness of Jesus. To learn that truth, is to practise it.

Paul is here trying men's works by *the true square*, the perfect standard of duty as it is found in Christ.

"And he gave some, Apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers. For the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. This I say, therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind. Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart. Who being past feeling have given themselves over to lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness. But ye have not so learned Christ. If so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus. That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts. And be renewed in the spirit of your mind. And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."—(Eph. iv. 11—13, 17—24.) "Be ye, therefore, followers of God, as dear children. And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us as an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour."—(Eph. v. 1, 2.)

Here we learn that the Redeemer desires the perfection of his followers, which is a *perfect man*—"the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ;" that we should so learn him as to practise him, as that "the truth in Jesus," the true standard of our perfection, may be exactly imitated; which lesson is practical, and involves putting off the old man, and putting on the new man; becoming like the Saviour.

This view of things is much overlooked; the truth in Jesus is often regarded as orthodox doctrine,—it is chiefly orthodox practice. It includes two things: the character of Jesus, what he truly was; and the character of his true followers.

"Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me;" that is, imitate the true account of man's duties exhibited in my life.

This is no lesson to be learned by rote; we are not reckoned to know Christ except by imitation; the *road he walked cannot be known by maps*; we must walk it ourselves, so shall we "*know him and the fellowship of his sufferings*,"—sharing in them.

The description of an object is a very different thing to the sight and trial of it. "And hereby do we *know that we know him*, if we keep his commandments. He that saith I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him. . . . He that saith he abideth in him (Christ) ought himself also so to walk, even as he (Christ) walked."—(1 John ii. 3—6.) This is learning "the truth as in Jesus," forming a *true acquaintance* with the Redeemer as we walk along the road with him: to all else he says—now, ye know me not, and will say at the last, "*I never knew you*." He does not recognize as his friends any that do not keep his commandments, which commandments are, to imitate the truth in him—the trueness of human perfection. The true beauty of holiness and panoply of perfection is described by the Apostle, "but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the lusts of the flesh."—(Rom. xiii. 14.) "For as many of you as have been (truly) baptized unto Christ, have put on Christ."—(Gal. iii. 27.) This is being baptized into Christ, putting Christ on; being clothed with his spirit. This is the truth as in Jesus, true goodness is exhibited in him, and forming our test and pattern.

The Apostle Paul told his converts to be followers of him, so far as he followed Christ. Now the Saviour never says anything of this kind, nor do the Apostles for him.

There is no limitation: the truth is in him in perfection; all men have defects; therefore are to be followed with a caution,—the truth and the falsehood are mingled together. But this example stands alone; no one can find a defect in it. And we are told to follow it without fear or carefulness as to being led astray.

Christ himself lays down the principle, that *his life is our truth of action and character*.

"So after he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them, know ye what I have done to you? Ye all call me Master and Lord; and ye say well, for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you."—(John xiii. 12—15.)

Besides, the condescension, love, and purity manifested in his whole life in general, we may fix upon two points in his course, which stand as pregnant symbols of Christian duty,—the truth for all men to practise,—his death and resurrection.

These two are closely associated, and are full of moral : not only is the death of Christ our source of pardon and motive for obedience, it is also the pattern of our obedience in several respects. In that also he set us an example. First, there was in it, submission to the divine will,—not my will, but thine be done; to inspire his followers with the sublime heroism of dependence on God, and defiance of all evils in submitting to him.

This principle sanctifies heroism, whilst it invigorates men for the conflict, as they love God and fear nothing. And this when all the world was against him; “yet I am not alone, for the Father is with me.” And at the last he gave us another lesson of confidence: “into thy hands I commend my spirit;” it was no blind leap in the dark, but ascending to his Father and ours through the baptism of his suffering and blood.

This is a hard lesson, to submit to God’s will, his disposal in all confidence. It is one great trial of our Christian virtue; can you *suffer and trust*, bless God, and bravely endure, like Christ, as the truth is in him? The Son of man is then with you in the fire, and you shall not be consumed.—(Heb. xii. 1–6.)

“He, though a son,” “learned obedience by the things which he suffered,” thus was the captain of our salvation—perfect through suffering, tried as we are; a man of sorrows, yet saying, “thy will be done,” that we may say the same; and then will angels come and strengthen our souls.

Thus in his death, we learn the first lesson, of devout, heroic, sublime patience and trust in God, who passes us through the fire, that the “trial of our faith being much more precious, &c.”

This is the process by which we are to lose all earthly dross, and become weaned from earthly things.

(2) Secondly, his death contains the truth, that we are willingly to forego all tempting good, and endure all privation for truth and righteousness.

We are to take a lofty standing and new measure of things, by the measures and scales of eternity: and be prepared to feel nothing as truly evil, but sin itself; as we glory in suffering like Christ and for Christ.—(1 Peter ii. 19–24.)

(3) We are to learn the lesson of benevolence, taught in his sacrifice for man.

We cannot redeem men, as he did, but we can do them good, at our own risk and cost;—at a real sacrifice. Thus we are to be prepared to “lay down our lives, for the brethren.” This is a hard saying; for who fares harder, or sleeps less softly, or works more, simply for the good of others? Yet this is one truth in Christ, for us.—(Phil. ii. 4–8.) Finally, his death, was a death for and to sin:—that we should also take up *that cross*—his entire cross, and mortify the flesh, &c. (Rom. vi. 1–13. Phil. iii. 9–13. Eph. ii. 4–6. Col. iii. 1–4.)

This is the true doctrine of the cross for us, beyond its atoning sacri-

fice;—that we shall have fellowship or partnership with his sufferings; share in all the spiritual meaning of his death and resurrection:—being conformable to his death (to sin) as the avenue to his resurrection, that as Christ died and rose, we should die to sin, and rise in newness of life.

Thus in the submissiveness of the Saviour to his appointed lot, even unto death, we have a lesson of solid peace and true greatness, to suffer and trust, and like THE SON to learn in the school of sorrow, fetching comfort out of evil, hope out of despair.

Whilst further, in the same death scene, we are taught to forego all temporary good, and brave all earthly evil out of conscience towards God: to be allured by no pleasure, deterred by no suffering, but to find our meat and drink, our honour and reward in doing and enduring the will of our Father.

And this our endurance and activity, must be willingly supported for the sake of benevolence as a real sacrifice for the good of others, that “the same mind may be in us as was also in Christ Jesus.”

The lesson of the Saviour’s death, is concluded by its relation to sin, that since in that he died, he died unto sin once, so also we are to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God; in imitation of his resurrection.

Here are the elements of an exalted and sublime character; the divine will our guide, for which all things are to be loss; the glory of God in the good of men our aim, for which we are willing to suffer, doing good at our dearest cost; whilst we enter the tomb with Christ, and view all things by the light of our last farewell, when pleasure and wealth, and everything inordinately prized, are weighed in new scales; and from thus being planted in the likeness of his death, we rise with him into the heavens, to live there in that high companionship, no more minding the things of the flesh as our chief concern, but dealing with all affairs in their relation to the Spirit, to God, and to eternity. Such, so exalted and superlatively grand, is “the truth in Jesus,” have we so learned it, as to make it the truth in us? For if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his.”

How often may we hear this echo in our conscience, when deviating from the true line; when sinking under troubles, repining, being buried and anxious in business; having too much trouble to think of Christ the alleviator; or too much pleasure too feel our need of him, absorbed in sense and time; being oppressed with poverty, or immersed in success;—in how many innumerable states of mind, conditions in life, and courses of conduct, may we hear these words of Paul whispered in our conscience—but ye have not so learned Christ!

What manner of persons should we be, if we did but study this lesson well: we should be marked men; there would be no mistake about us: people would know in what school we were educated, and they also, might be led to “learn Christ.” We must give them the introductory lesson, and lead them to Jesus to learn from the master, who both died and rose again, that he might be the Lord of the dead and of the living; that in his example of love in its perfection displayed in our cause, he might prepare a lesson of perfection for us, and by the force of love and gratitude engage us in learning that lesson.

Do we then with him submit (in patient rejoicing confidence,) to the



divine will in trials? knowing that it is our refining process; that affliction worketh patience, &c.?

Do we abandon all tempting pleasures, and undergo all threatening evils, that would turn us from the path of known duty?

Are we joined with Christ in the enterprize of benevolence, in which we can willingly do good at any sacrifice? Not counting our ease or our purse, or our life dear, that we may be found in him, as the truth is in his example?

Have we been planted together in the likeness of his death to what is merely worldly, and risen with him in newness of life, to walk with God in the Spirit, as we dwell with men in the flesh?

If so, we "have learned Christ," and have become "new creatures in" him.

This is the second of the truths about man, to be found in Jesus; the first, is man's degeneracy; the second is man's regeneration,—the example and perfect standard of human excellence.

(3) The third truth about man in Christ, is our resurrection and future existence. The second truth is our moral resurrection, this third is our bodily resurrection, and resumption of existence beyond the grave. The second is an example, a body of moral truths or precepts, the true "counsels of perfection;" the third is an instance and *prophecy*, a *specimen and pledge of what is to occur to mankind*. He brought life and immortality to light, by taking a human form into the eternal regions.

It is in Jesus that this truth is displayed;—not by philosophical *reasons*, but *by an instance* of the divine power: and our prospect of eternity, rests on this corner stone.

We feel more confidence in facts, than in mere propositions, and therefore *all truth is made into a fact in Jesus*, and amongst the rest the truth of our resurrection; hence in writing to Corinthians the Apostle first states the fact, secondly, proves that consequently a resurrection is not impossible; and finally asserts that this one instance is not only a proof of possibility, but a pledge of certainty, given in Christ for us.—(1 Cor. xv. 3, 4; 12—20.)

He is the *first fruits*; as a pledge of the harvest; therefore, we know the harvest is certain. As Paul preached to Agrippa, that Christ should suffer and be *the first* that should rise.—(Acts xxvi. 23.)

The great problem therefore of a future existence, is solved by an instance; and this is the certainty for mankind, and the safety for those who trust to the Saviour; for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him."—(1 Thess. iv. 14.) So that the departing spirit is committed into the hands of Jesus, according to the dying prayer of Stephen; it goes to Jesus who is with God, and it will come from Paradise to be clothed with an immortal and transfigured body, when Christ shall change the living and raise the dead at the last day.

In Jesus is the truth of the glorification of the bodies of believers; since he rose not only from the dead, but into heaven, to prepare many mansions for those who through him do believe in God that raised him from the dead, and gave him glory as the illustration of our destiny. ~~We are to bear his image in our minds now, and in our entire condition~~

in heaven.—(1 Cor. xv. 41—49.) Such is the glorious inheritance of which he has taken possession in the name of redeemed humanity.

The truth that believers will go there, is embodied in the fact that Christ is there; in accordance with his desire, "that they may be with me where I am, and behold my glory." In the life of Christ on earth, we have the truth of our duties; in the glory of Christ in heaven, we have the truth of our hopes, the specimen and pledge of our final condition. But we must follow him on earth, to reach him in heaven.

For it is written, "blessed are those dead, who die in the Lord," since they live in him, "for our conversation is in heaven; whence also we look for the Saviour, who shall change our vile body, and fashion it like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself:" (Phil. iii. 20, 21.) to fashion us after the truth which is in himself—the true pattern of our eternal glory.

III. And this leads us to the **THIRD CLASS OF TRUTHS embodied in Christ**, namely, that **HE IS THE ONLY MEDIUM BY which we can attain to the perfection and glory** which are displayed in his earthly life and heavenly exaltation.

This truth is implied in his whole work and teaching, and with the exposition of this fact, we shall conclude the enquiry into the Canon of life and doctrine,—*the truth in Jesus*.

Hitherto we have chiefly followed the inspired teaching of the Apostles; but we shall now direct attention more fully to the words of Christ himself, respecting his own work and office.

The occasions on which our Lord uttered his various lessons, generally contributed to give them a greater emphasis of meaning; so that they are most fully understood, not as isolated sentences, but as set in the framework of the circumstances in which they arose.

The state of things in which he declared, "I AM THE WAY, AND THE TRUTH, AND THE LIFE," (John xiv. 6.) invests those words with peculiar beauty and significance: his disciples were at their wits end; entirely nonplussed; sorrow had filled their hearts because they were now anticipating with a half mysterious dread the hour of his departure; yet whilst he was about to be offered up, and had no road open to him but the road to the cross, he declares that he "is the way, and the truth, and the life."

This was exactly the declaration suited to the circumstances of the disciples, the most wanted, the hardest to believe, for every thing in outward appearance afforded a contradiction to the statement.

Yet he was "the way," when no path seemed open; when they were hedged in by the events of providence or the subtlety of enemies: he was "the truth" when all the world was declaring him a lie, and going to prove it by the demonstration of crucifixion: he was "the life," when about to taste of death, even the death of the cross.

It was hard to believe all this; it could be received only by faith, not by sight, for all things seemed against it.

Still the Redeemer had no doubt, to some extent, prepared the minds of his disciples for the partial reception of this consoling truth, to uphold them in the coming trial of his death, and their temporary abandonment.

Indeed, every one may perceive the considerate way in which the Re-

deemer proceeded with the instruction of his disciples, how he suited himself to their condition, and acted according to the ordinary laws of the human mind; so that he might not only instruct them by degrees, but also, which was equally necessary, awaken and secure their affections and conscience in the cause of the truths thus revealed.

Hence, he taught them by little and little, as they could bear it; never deceiving them with immediate prospects of earthly success, yet not telling them all until they had grown equal to the reception. Nay, we find that to the very last of his earthly life, he had to assure them, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now;" and it was "expedient" that he "should go away" in order to be more fully manifested.

Nevertheless, he must, to some extent, gain their understanding and affections, in order to secure their patient continuance till his resurrection and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost: and accordingly he thus gradually unfolded himself, his mission, and their future trials. He first displayed his power in his miracles, his wisdom in teachings, his holiness in living, and so inspired a confidence in his condescending majesty; then commenced the hints regarding his death, following up these in course of time with clear and positive statements, that "the Son of Man must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the chief priests and Scribes, and be delivered unto the Gentiles, to be mocked, scourged, and crucified."

But, lest this prospect should too much weaken their faith since Peter (the boldest of them) revolted at the expectation, saying, "that be far from thee, Lord," he took with him Peter, and James, and John, to be transfigured before them on the mount, and receive the testimony of Moses and Elias, as well as that of a voice from heaven; that so they might gain a well balanced confidence, and be prepared for the agony in the garden, as well as for the catastrophe on the cross.

And here, as all this is closely approaching, whilst their master speaks of his coming sufferings and their own, he bids them have faith in God and in himself: for that if he departs, he will come again; he will send the comforter as his substitute; whilst the departure itself is declared to be a ground for rejoicing, since he is going to the Father, to prepare a place, and will come again and receive them to himself in those mansions whither he is going before, only to get all things ready for them.

To this place, whither he was thus going, he was himself the way for them; along this way he is their truth as a light and guide; and during the journey he is their life, or the strength to perform it.

And this is all we want, in order to accomplish successfully any important journey, namely, a safe road, a sure guide, and health, support, strength, or life, to travel.

These three things Christ declares himself to be, in our journey to the Father, whatever the stages of that journey may be.

The terms in which this statement is made, are forcible, clear, and consoling; yet, instead of being received with simplicity, they are too often entertained with debate, speculation and suspicion; as if they required to be softened and toned down into the soberness of empty truisms.

Some appear to have adopted the maxim—not to overtask the Redeemer, by expecting too much from him, and hence they would not believe

him from part of his bond, taking a discount off his words, lest he should dishonour them, and fail in his large undertakings: thus do they dishonour him. Because these words of Christ contain much truth, they have (like the men who bring unwelcome truth) been much tortured;—turned and twisted every way for some discovery by which the meaning may be diminished, the Saviour freed from too great obligations, and the believer robbed of too large expectations.

We are too much afraid of taking the words of Christ *literally*, because the priests of Rome have (like the Jews and the Apostles in their unenlightened state) received them *carnally*. It is supposed that if Christ is *literally* "the way, and the truth," then he is literally *bread*, so the popish transubstantiation is supposed and confirmed.

But we must not sacrifice a doctrine of the gospel, in order to avoid some superstition of Rome. The Saviour is *literally bread*, only not bread for the body; not such bread as the father's did eat in the wilderness and yet have died; but the true bread which cometh down from heaven,—**LITERALLY BREAD FOR THE SOUL**. The very same to the soul as corn bread is to the body, its daily nourishment. The bread of life, not the bread of *this* life, but the bread of the *next* life, truly and really such bread without any figure of speech.

If men had but leisure or disposition to *think* clearly on certain questions of religion, they would clear their minds of much delusion and mystification arising from the false use of such terms as *literal* and *figurative*, and discover that what is often termed a "*figure*," is simply a literal application of a name to another class of objects, but still retaining the full and usual meaning of the name.

This may easily be understood by a simple rule, for which there are illustrations in abundance, namely, that the Saviour's statements respecting himself, are truly and absolutely literal, and are to be taken as applying to his spiritual relations; in other words, *they are literal as belonging to the soul*, for which Christ came, and to which his teachings refer.

All words need to be interpreted by the subject in hand; the subject with Christ, was his relation to our souls, and all his descriptions of himself are true, literal, and real, in this reference.

As (in John xv.) he is "the true vine," of which his disciples are the branches; he is such a vine to them; they *are* branches to him: the relation is true and real, as true and real as in a tree growing in a vineyard. And the branches of Christ bear fruit, not grapes, but fruit after the kind of the tree to which they belong, just as all other branches do; so these produce the true grapes of the true vine,—the vintage of God; growing in his garden, and under his cultivation. All these things are literal as appertaining to the soul and Christ. So is he a door; not a wooden door on metal hinges; for such a door opens only into the house of an earthly family; but he is the door which opens into heaven, into the mansions above;—truly and really a door for that purpose to the souls of believers.

In the same real and literal force we adopt the three terms applied by Christ to himself, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life."

(1) He is really "the way," a term which cannot be said to belong exclusively to any one kind of way; and is as literally applied to the

le,  
th  
as i  
mpt.  
task  
woul

Saviour, as to any object. For what is meant by a *way* in language applied to other questions than the gospel? Is it not simply a means of attaining any end; or a path to any place? And of these there are various kinds, equally literal; there are streets, footpaths over fields, bridle roads, country lanes, highways, and railways: Christ is none of these, but as truly a way as any of them; they lead to places in this world, villages or towns on earth; he is the king's highway to the metropolis of heaven; the direct, sure, and only road to a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.

He is as really and literally a road as they are, for that is the road which leads to any place, along which we may arrive at any desired destination; and the Saviour leads to our Father's house, being the only way by which we can get there, for "no man cometh unto the Father, but by me."

(2) The Redeemer is also literally and really the truth; not merely the speaker of the truth, but its practical embodiment and living exhibition; he is *not merely the truth as our MASTER, but the truth as our LESSON*, we have to *learn him* as the highest attainment. We read no statement of this kind respecting the Apostle Paul, who by way of verbal communication conveyed more full instructions than the Redeemer, yet Paul is never called the truth, he only "preached Christ," "the truth" that was "in Jesus;" that is, he explained the real nature and work of the Saviour; who was "the truth," the reality or text from which Paul and his fellow labourers taught, by the aid of the Holy Ghost, who was to reveal Christ in his entire character.

And as we say of any statement which we believe—that it is the truth; as we declare the same of it, when it is written in a book,—that its contents are the truth, so Christ is the word by which God hath spoken and does speak to us, and what is to be discovered in Christ is "the truth" for our guidance to salvation.

What the nature of these truths are has appeared in our previous enquiry;—truths about God in his divinity; about man in his mortal condition; exhibited in the mission, life, death, resurrection, and ascension of the Saviour, as a living parable of man's necessities and hopes.

We have not, therefore, to enter further into these questions here, but only to exhibit the Saviour as "*the way and the life,*" *the only means by which we can attain to "the truth" which has been displayed in him.*

(3.) For when Christ is called "the life," we do not understand merely that he is the way to happiness, but that he is the spiritual life, or quickener and invigorator of the soul, in its journey towards holiness and heaven.

What the Redeemer hath gone through in temptation, evils, and death, in purity, victory, and glory, is "the truth," we have to learn—to learn by imitation and experience; but the road to this mark of the prize, and the living vigour to traverse that road, are also in Christ.

And this is our present subject for consideration, viz.:—

CHRIST THE WAY AND THE LIFE, BY WHICH WE ATTAIN TO THE TRUTH THAT IS IN HIM.

What this truth is, may be summed up in few words—in Christ; his mission and treatment on earth, we see reflected, the sinful and dangerous

condition of mankind : in the holiness of the Saviour's life we see the true perfection of man as restored and regenerate ; in the resurrection and glorification of the Redeemer, we see affirmed in the emphatic method of an instance, that man will rise, and may be glorified in the presence of God for ever.

This is "the truth in Jesus" about the world's state and prospects ; but the question comes, how shall all this truth be reached and realized ? And the answer is given by the Saviour himself, I am not only "the truth," but also "THE WAY AND THE LIFE."

Through him we reach the Father.

1. By his atonement, as he is the way of reconciliation to the Father.

2. He is the way of communion or intercourse with the Father,—by his intercession.

3. He is the life, or quickener and supporter in attaining sanctification,—the likeness of the Father.

4. He is the way through the grave, by the resurrection into the Father's immediate presence in eternal glory. So he is the way and the life, by which alone we come to the Father, on earth and in heaven.

1. He is the way of reconciliation to the Father ; that, as in his work on earth he displayed the truth of the sin of man—our alienation and distance from God by wicked works—so he should remove this distance and bring us together by his atoning blood. "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," "having, therefore, brethren boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a *new and living way* which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say his flesh,—and having a high priest over the household of God, let us *draw near* with a true heart in full assurance of faith."—(Heb. x. 14, 19—22.)

Apart from this reconciling, we are regarded as afar off from God, strangers and foreigners ; but we are brought nigh by the blood of Christ, which not only reconciles Jew and Gentile to one another by one method of salvation, but reconciles *both Jew and Gentile unto God* in one body by the cross. And thus is peace preached unto all that we should no more be "strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God."—(Eph. ii. 12—20.) Thus is Christ the way into God's favour and true family, as by him our sins are forgiven, and our acceptance secured. "For Christ also hath once suffered, the just for the unjust, that he might *bring us to God*." (1 Pet. iii. 18.) That there might be a way of safety open to us. No other road will bring us unto him ; and if, therefore, we have not peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, then has the Saviour died "in vain,"—"we are yet in our sins." But "there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," who are brought nigh by his blood. The way thus opened to us is required for all mankind : there was no way of return to God's favour, and no way of retreat from his justice—no possibility of pardon or escape, except this way, which is Christ,—a way for all, since "he is able to save unto the uttermost them *that come unto God by him* ;" all that travel along this safe and appointed way. There are other ways, along which men may travel ; but this is the only way to God's favour : "no man cometh unto the Father but by me."

Whoever has fled for refuge along this road is perfectly safe; none can pluck us out of the Saviour's hands: as the slave who steps on British soil is emancipated from the claims and tyranny of his old master, so whoever steps along this road of reconciliation to God is thereby emancipated from all the claims of the great adversary, and "justified from all things from which he could not be justified by the law of Moses."

In this way of escape we require no human mediation; we have not to pay toll to a priest; the road does not lie through Rome nor any Gothic archway. No one is mentioned here but Christ; all else are ignored, all priests and their absolutions are impertinent,—“no man cometh unto the Father but by me.”

2. Christ is the way to continued communion or intercourse with God, which is secured to us by his intercession, as he abides in heaven in the character of an ambassador from earth, the friend and representative of mankind. By this means he has opened a real correspondence, and we have no reason to suppose that any praise or praises offered to the Father, apart from the name of the Son, will be accepted, when offered by those who have heard of Christ as the medium by which God speaks to us, and through which we speak to him.

Some, indeed, vainly talk of inspiration now, and declare that God is still living and holding original direct communications with men; that the Bible is only one amongst the many revelations with which God has favoured the world.

There would be some consolation in this doctrine, if any persons could be found who have any real oracles to advance; but until we find the wisdom of which they boast, who are superior to the wisdom of the Bible, we may reasonably confine ourselves to that method of divine communion afforded to us by the Scriptures.

The same is true of those religionists who set aside the mediation of Christ, and rely on God's mercy, appeal to him as a father in their natural relationship, without any Christian provision for intercourse after reconciliation.

Whereas it is by being justified through faith in the death of Christ, that we have peace with God through Jesus Christ our Lord. And then, *being at peace, we have intercourse through him.*—(Rom. iv. 22—11 of v.)

Thus it is by faith in the atonement we have peace with God, and through a living, interceding Saviour that we are permitted to have access into this grace, wherein we stand: and hence he is the living daily way into our *Father's presence*,—as he himself teaches, “*whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son.* If ye shall ask *anything in my name* I will do it.”—(John xiv. 13, 14.)

If, therefore, any man, having this word in his hand, shall address the Father without doing it in the name of Christ, it is an act of presumption. As in a constitutional government, none may address the Sovereign but through the appointed officers of government, so none may address God but through the Mediator, who has secured to us this privilege. Through him we may seek all grace; through him pardon for our imperfections: “if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father.” “Who is he

that condemneth? is it Christ that died? Yea, rather that is risen again, who also maketh intercession for us.”—(Rom. viii. 34.)

Since then we have this “Mediator between God and man,” who took our form to be our Mediator, this is the only way to communion with God.—(Heb. iv. 14—16.)

3. Christ is the *life*, as enabling us to follow in the road of his example, which is our earthly way to heaven.

In other words, he invigorates us to walk along this way. He opens it before us, and helps us to travel it.

It is from the hopes he gives, the love he thus inspires, that we attain to any spiritual power, and become quickened together with Christ.

Hence the grand mistake of those who, feeling their inability, withhold from acknowledging Christ, lest they should be unable to follow him afterwards. Since it is from believing in Christ that we receive the promised Spirit; and what we could not do before we felt assured of pardon, now becomes easy and natural, by a second nature. Hence the Apostle gives an account of his own native weakness, and finds the secret of new power.—(Rom. vii. 18—5 of viii.)

Now, to receive Christ and become allied to him, is to secure new motives and helps for minding the things of the Spirit, as we become heavenly-minded, by having a treasure in heaven; for to be in Christ is to have Christ in us. “And if Christ be in you, the body is dead, because of sin, &c.” “But if the spirit of him that raised Jesus from the dead be in you, this shall quicken your mortal bodies,” give spiritual life to your dead faculties.

This great truth is fully exhibited in the parable of the true vine: where Christ is our life-preserving power, and fertilizing energy.

Thus are we “built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together *groweth up into a holy temple in the Lord*; in whom ye are builded together for a habitation of God, through the Spirit.”—(Eph. ii. 20—22.)

By this means we reach the truth of our perfect nature (as exhibited in the character of the Saviour)—by the motives, hopes, example and aid which he imparts.

4. He is the way to the resurrection of man’s body, and the glorification of his entire nature; the truth that men will be raised was expressed in the Saviour’s history; asserted emphatically when he rose; and it will be accomplished by his mighty power.

For as the soul of man was imprisoned in the condemned cell of justice; from which it was redeemed by the sacrifice of Christ, so he will give life to the body, freeing it from the prison-house of death; and will thus become *the way out of the grave*. And that he might be master over the grave, the Lord of the dead and of the living, he came under the liability of death; that Satan might bruise his heel, that he might be put to death in the flesh; and shew that it was not *possible for him to be holden of it*; he went into the prison in our form, to open a way out of it for our race. He let Satan bind this spiritual Sampson with the green withs of the grave, to burst them and free the world.

This is forcibly described in language not often understood.—(Heb. ii. 6—15.)



To give man his intended and proper supremacy, as being under none but God, Christ came under all our burdens, and rose above them to *put all things under our feet*, as we rise with him.

Hence the beautiful and forcible exultation in the Revelations, "I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, and have the keys of hell and death." These keys are the proprietorship of that prison, which he will open, as *the way for man out of the grave*.

He is also the way to final glorification. He will glorify our bodies. "For our conversation is in heaven, whence also we look for the Saviour, who shall change our vile bodies, and fashion them like unto his glorious body."

He is preparing the mansions, and will equip us for them; that we may be with him, where he is, behold and share in his glory.

We are to see him as he is, and be like him: he is the truth for us here, and the truth for us there. Thus is he the way to the Father, on earth, in reconciliation and intercourse; in heaven, for our final dwelling place.

His present exaltation then, is the truth of what is in store for us, and he is the way by which that truth will be realized.

## II.

# PRIESTS' RELIGION.

## HUMAN AUTHORITY AND INVENTION *versus* CONSCIENCE AND THE BIBLE.

The Scriptures are the only standard of Christian faith and practice: every one is at liberty to examine them; but no one is at liberty to decline this examination: and though we may receive the help of others, we may not rest on their authority, (which is man-worship;) nor receive as religion, what is not in the Scriptures, (which is will-worship.)

---

## THE EPHESIAN DIANA, AND THE MODERN SHRINE MAKERS.

AN OLD SERMON, PREACHED OVER AGAIN.\*

*"Sirs! ye know that by this craft we have our wealth."*—Acts xix. 25.

WE need only transfer the scene of action from Ephesus to Rome, or to any other city or country, where ambitious and worldly priests trample upon all the rights of truth, reason, and conscience, in order to prove these two points.

I. That Popery is a *craft*, a human craft.

II. That it is a craft, a trade invented and managed with a sole view to get wealth, power, and greatness; or to exalt priests into lords over mankind.

And it is the *gainfulness* of this craft, which supplies the Popish priests with so furious a zeal to maintain its credit, and support its practice.

It is equally true that all worldly establishments, and Anti-Christian devices brought into religion, are crafts, political engines for loading a set of proud, tyrannical, worldly clergymen with the wealth of the laity.

Consequently, a deliverance from such a set of men, is a very great and merciful deliverance, and ought to be had in everlasting remembrance.

The whole may be reduced to *one point*, namely:—that Popery is a human invention to befool, enslave and impoverish the laity; and to magnify and enrich the clergy.

No wonder then if the spiritual tradesmen are very loth to give up their gainful craft.

I shall name a few doctrines and practises of Rome, a short view of which will shew the truth of our positions and justify the application of the text to our present purpose.

1. For instance, what can be said for the universal headship and infallibility of the Pope? Why, Sirs! ye know that by this craft we get

\* The above was preached by the Rev. J. BASSET, and is sent to "the Bible and the People," as one of those valuable relics buried in scarce old Tracts.—EDITOR.

our wealth. By virtue of this doctrine, we claim a power over king's, a right to dispose of crowns and kingdoms, and to tax all countries, as once we did England, till God opened their eyes, and then our gainful trade was at an end.\*

By virtue of this doctrine, we hook in abundance of money for vacancies of archbishoprics, abbacies, and all spiritual places: for retaining of livings without residence; for change of incumbents; for preventions of benefices before they fall; for resignations, commendams, compositions, dispensations, bulls, giving the pall, &c. &c.

By virtue of this doctrine, we bring all spiritual causes into our own courts, where they are managed at a vast expence to the laity, and bring great gain to the clergy.

By virtue of this doctrine, we persuade people to obey whatever the Pope decreeth; and we are sure that all his decrees will take care of the clergy.

2. But how come you, gentlemen priests, to claim freedom from secular jurisdiction, and to pretend that *lay judges* have no authority over *Churchmen*?

Why, by this craft we have our wealth: hereby we clergymen are fixed in our dependence on the Pope, who connives at all our rogueries. In all criminal causes, we are to be tried by our spiritual brethren, and courts made up of our own tribe will never hurt us: be we ever such knaves, we hardly ever come to the gallows, while priests are our own judges.

By this doctrine, we not only save our necks, but we preserve the mastership of our own wealth; and hereby our spiritual powers shine above those of temporal princes.

3. Why do you priests insist upon *auricular confession*, and oblige all the laity to tell all the secrets of their life, in private to you? By this craft we get our wealth. All our people fear disobliging us, knowing what tales we are able to tell against them.

By this art we fetch out all the secrets of kings and kingdoms, and keep the world in awe.

We get many a bribe for secrecy, and have it any time in our power to revenge our own quarrel.

Besides, the *penances* we enjoin are a very gainful part of our trade, as we are able to sell *commutations* of penance at our own price.

4. This leads us to enquire, what can be said for dispensations and indulgences to sin for times to come, and pardons for sins in times past, which the Pope and the priests pretend to bestow?

Why, *Sirs!* ye know that by this craft we have our wealth. We get a *world of money*, by this article of our trade. These indulgences cost us very little, yet the deluded people buy them at great rates. They will give round sums for a liberty to sin, or to quit scores with God and the priest after sinning. We know, indeed, when a man is condemned by God, it will be a poor comfort to him, that he hath the *Pope's pardon* in his pocket; but the priestly power of absolutism, is so well established in the Church, that we think our trade pretty safe; we have so effectually hoodwinked the laity, that we hope they will not easily be undeceived.

\* See in Fox's *Acts and Monuments*, vol. i. p. 369. A table of the Pope's Gatherings, exactions, and oppressions in the realm of England.

5. But pray, gentlemen, how can you defend the doctrine of purgatory, a place of future torments, out of which souls may be delivered by the masses of priests? Why, *Sirs*, all the world, except our own slaves, know, that by this craft we have our wealth.

Who would not give a good deal of money, rather than lie many years in torment; especially at a time when he can keep his money no longer, and giveth what is scarcely his own? Can a sinner make a *better hand* of his wealth than by giving it to priests to be soon prayed into heaven? This is the most wonderful trick in all our craft, for purging the pockets of the laity.

Besides, it procureth us a vast reverence, when people believe our powers reach into the other world, and can affect them beyond death. What will not people do to please men who have the keys of heaven and hell!

Moreover, this art we are able to manage in the greatest perfection; as we are bred up in all the methods of craft and subtlety, we know how to treat every constitution, to humour every inclination, to apply to every passion, to suit ourselves to every season.

It is our constant maxim to attend the beds of dying sinners, and the more flaming their vices have been, the better hope we have of success: we take advantage of their distempers, and their natural fears, to overwhelm the poor wretches with terrible ideas of purgatory, of which we believe not a word ourselves, we confound their imaginations by our awful descriptions, and cherish every superstitious fear we have raised; at length our patients lose all liberty, strength and capacity of reasoning; they take any impression we desire; then, with wonderful address and cunning, and with all the airs of gravity and concern, we sell our ghostly advice and consolation to the dying, at what price we please, and if we give them any hope, and pronounce absolution, they are sure to pay dear for it. Thus by this craft, we get our wealth.

6. But can anything be offered to defend creature-worship, reverence to the Virgin, devotion to dead saints and dead sinners, a veneration for images and relics? Yes, by this craft we get our wealth. Such offerings are brought to our Churches, and the shrines of our canonized saints, that they excel the palaces of princes in costly ornaments; the officers of our churches are maintained like noblemen; and in many countries, we have engrossed almost a third part of the land and riches of the kingdom: our WOODEN GODS have procured us a deal of good money.

Our churches and abbeys are a resource of boundless wealth on any extraordinary occasion. We are able to maintain spies, in all courts, and to send emissaries into all countries, and pay armies to support the hierarchy.

Old girdles, bits of rotten wood, the legs of an ass, and other precious ware, we can sell at vast rates, our market for these holy trifles runs indeed higher or lower, as the number of fools is, who come to buy, but they generally go off for ready money.

7. But can the monstrous doctrine of *Transubstantiation* be defended? Yes; by this craft we get our wealth. This wonderful trick we got, of turning bread into a real human body, creates in people a prodigious reverence for a man who, by pronouncing a few words can produce so ex-

traordinary an effect. When once we have brought people to believe this, they will then swallow every other doctrine the priests shall teach.

This exceedingly magnifies the clergy, who, having got dominion over the understandings and consciences of the laity, easily assume an empire over their purses. We own it requires an uncommon stock of *impudence*, thus to outface people's reason and senses, their eye-sight, feeling, taste, smell, hearing; but we have carried our point for some ages; and are resolved to stand by it as long as we can.

8. And why are the laity deprived of their Bibles, unless a special license be obtained? And have you priests the sole authority to interpret Scripture? And why must men in worshipping God, do and say they know not what, by saying their prayers in Latin?

Why, *Sirs!* ye know that by this craft we have our wealth. This is our fundamental art: we are undone, and our trade is at an end, if the laity read and understand the Bible, and begin to open their eyes.

The Bible is the most dangerous book that ever was printed; if it go abroad, all our craft is in danger: and we are in terrible fear *that the art of printing* will one day be our ruin. As to our claim to interpret the Scriptures for our people, this keeps us masters of the faith and understandings of the laity. And *unintelligible prayers* help to keep men blind, and support an opinion "that it is enough if their priests pray and understand for them."

9. If it be asked, why is celibacy and a monastic life so strictly required, and so much exalted? The answer is still the same. This keeps all our wealth amongst the clergy; whereas, by the priest's marriage, it would be scattered among the unhallowed laity. To make us amends, we are indulged in all liberties with the fair sex, yet freed from the expense of mistress and offsprings.

10. Again, why are the laity denied *one-half* of the sacrament? To keep all the rich wines for the priests, and to make a sufficient distinction between the order of *holy men* and the *common herd*. Yet we have a trick in Protestant countries, to cheat people by a *cup of ablution*, instead of the *cup of consecration*.

11. Why are works of *supererogation* defended? To fill the Pope's coffers, by the sale of them.

12. Why are so many *holy days* instituted and imposed by your Church? To keep the laity poor, and to indulge them in sensual pleasures, that they may not feel the yoke of the priests, nor trouble their heads with reading and religious disputes, which always turn to our disadvantage.

13. Why are such a crowd of ceremonies introduced into your worship? When we have robbed and cheated our people of their understandings, consciences, religion, liberties, wealth, we must *substitute something* in their room; and we endeavour to amuse and divert them by a train of fopperies, and christen them by the name of *devotion*. We paint and adorn our churches, erect and enrich altars, and make all our worship magnificent and gaudy, on purpose to be a bait to catch the eyes and

NOTE.—From the *Hoc est Corpus* of Popish Church jugglers is derived the *hocus pocus* of our market jugglers, who impose upon the vulgar with more art, but with less impudence than the Romish priests.

dazzle the imaginations of the deluded people, who are pleased with this pomp; and diverted from any inquiries about the truth of our worship, or the foundation of our claims.

We dress a clergy up in a very solemn manner, and in peculiar habits, on purpose to cover their ignorance or want of virtue by an exterior garb, that our persons may be revered where no deference is due to our parts, learning or integrity.

14. Lastly, what can be said to justify all the hellish plots, treacheries, treasons, and cruelties of the Church of Rome? All this is for the good of the Church. We only practise these where our arts fail, and men begin to despise us and our trade. If heaven do not favour us, we press hell into our service and are able to consecrate the greatest villainies and the most barbarous cruelties. Then the estates and riches of murdered heretics fall to the share of the priests; and by this craft we have our wealth.

From the whole, doth it not appear that Popery is merely a *human invention*—a worldly engine, to greaten and enrich an army of tyrannical, haughty, luxurious, idle, knavish, ill-mannered clergymen? That it is a craft to get the wealth of the world into the hands of the priests. That it is a kingdom *wholly of this world*,—supported by worldly laws, worldly maxims and policies, worldly rewards and terrors. That all the strength of Popery lies in these two points: THE BLINDNESS OF THE LAITY; THE GAINS OF THE CLERGY.

By all their peculiar doctrines are the priests gainers; they gain dominion over conscience, reverence to their persons, or wealth into their purses, by making the laity slaves, fools, and beggars.

From the whole account, it appears further, “that Popery is a religion worse than *Deism*, as it is contradictory of all the principle of reason, and utterly inconsistent with all our ideas of the perfection of God. Yea, that it is worse than *Atheism* itself, which can only deprive us of all religious motives to be virtuous; whereas, Popery inspires us with the strongest motives to be vicious: it fills us with that hatred to mankind but those of our own persuasion; it tears up every moral principle, and under a solemn pretence of supernatural charity, destroys all humanity.”

But as surely as there is a God and a Providence,—as surely as the gospel is true, so surely those craftsmen will not always be gainers by their craft; their trade will fail them. It is a dark Providence, that the priests’ reign has endured so long; it is a scene which shows the need and proveth the certainty of a *future judgment*.

From the whole, it appears how great is our deliverance from these spiritual tyrants. What a blessing was the discovery of the Powder Plot! What a blessing King William was! What a blessing, King George and the present Royal Family.

But I expect you are ready to ask the reason I so soon quit the scene at Ephesus, and the story of the Pagan High Church mob there, which is so much to my purpose?

This story is so well represented, embellished, and applied in print, that there is scarce room for improvement; however, as few of you have, perhaps, seen that discourse, I shall in the lively terms of that Author, and in an easy and natural method, give you such a view of this curious piece

of history as will convince you that all High Church priests, whether at Rome or elsewhere, are spiritual craftsmen, traders for the wealth and honours of this world!

To enter, then, upon our curious subject, you see at verse 21 what vast and noble designs possessed the breast of St. Paul: he aims at spreading light all over Europe, and delivering souls from captivity to the devil and cheating priests in all countries. From Ephesus he is hastened away by a GREAT STIR raised against the new gospel-way of worshipping one God. (v. 23.) If God enjoin and direct men to enter so clear and good a way to heaven, yet many will reject it, only because it is a *new way*. But surely it is better to go in a new way to heaven, than to keep in the old way to hell. Antiquity, custom, forefathers, and universality have been ancient pleas to keep men in darkness and error.

Let us further open the contents of this story in some inquiries. As, first, who raised this *commotion*?

It was the CRAFTSMEN, with one Demetrius at the head of them. Men who manufactured and traded in religious fopperies; sacred TOYMEN, who dealt in images, beads, wafers, *Agnus Dei's*, holy water, and holy garments, &c. These, in Romish Churches, answer the *shrines* for DIANA in the Pagan Church at Ephesus. (v. 24.)

Diana was a she-deity, originally the moon, called by the Pagan priests, the Queen of Heaven.

These shrines were little capsulas or cases, in the form of a temple, with the image of this goddess in them.

Whenever God raises up a number of excellent preachers, or holy livers, superstitious and sensual priests will raise up a GREAT STIR against them. CRAFTSMEN who get money by the folly and ignorance of the people, will oppose God and Christ, and raise war against heaven, rather than part with their gain.

The goodly trade of image making must be supported, whatever become of religion and the souls of men.

Let us enquire, *secondly*,—*what method* doth this craftsman, this high Church Zealot, take to oppose the *new way* which Christ and St. Paul were setting up?

He assembles all the master-workmen, and tribe of journeymen, (v. 24, 25.) and gathers a mob, suppose of hireling priests, curates, friars, monks, and makes to them an elegant harangue. Thus begins his sermon—"Sirs! ye know that by this craft we have our wealth." Very true; were it not for the craft of cheating the people, and fobbing of poor souls with shews and gestures, bowings, crossings, and holy sprinklings; the trade of worldly priests would be at an end. Religion and real holiness are matters they deal very little in. If once people throw away relics, Pope's pardons, holy water, masses, and crosses, the priests are ruined. Touch but the wealth of these holy men, reform their spiritual courts, and suffer them to get no more money by the sins of the people, and they will raise terrible outcries, as if all religion was at stake. Nothing so galls worldly Churchmen, or so kindles their zeal, as fears of losing their wealth. They will storm like thunder, ride and write like furies, to prevent reformation. Luther and Calvin threw them into such a fright, they have scarce recovered themselves to this day.

This leads us to enquire, *thirdly*, *who was the man* that durst touch this craft of theirs, and endeavour to bring the people to their senses? It was one PAUL, a *Protestant minister*, who protested against all Church corruptions: a *Dissenting minister*, who dissented from the religion established at Ephesus; and who had disturbed almost one half of the world by his preaching. (v. 26.)

ONE MAN, with Truth and Christ on his side, is able to defeat a whole army, a whole hierarchy of craftsmen, if he be allowed a fair hearing.

One Paul, one Luther, one Calvin, is an over-match for all the hireling priests in the world.

*One poor monk*, in whom the light of gospel truth began to shine, shakes the whole papal kingdom, and confounds Pope, cardinals, bishops, and priests, without any other aid, but the truth and goodness of his cause.

But let us enquire, *fourthly*, what was the great heresy that Paul preached? Why, *that they be no gods, which are made with hands*, (v. 26.) Wicked doctrine indeed! the very heresy of Protestants; that POPISH IDOLS are no gods; that crossings, bowings to the altar, and to the east, holy garments and holy days, are a parcel of human inventions.

What barbarous murders did the Papists commit a few years ago,\* at Thorn, in Poland, because the Protestants burnt two or three of their WOODEN GODS! Was St. Paul to rise from the dead, and preach, and live as he did, the Papists would burn him alive as a heretic, a man not fit to live.

Now, *fifthly*, what is like to be the consequence of such heretical preaching as Paul's was? Why, *this our craft is in danger to be set at nought*. (v. 27.)

Very true; when people's eyes are opened, they will give no more money for pardons, masses, commutations of penance, priestly absolutions, &c. And then priestcraft signifies nothing. There are a set of men, who turn their churches into *toy-shops*, show-rooms, and music-meetings; and when they are laughed at, cry, "they are in danger."

It is no wonder, indeed, that Churches made up of human inventions, governed by secular Canons, supported by worldly interest and temporal power, should be *in danger*; but the true Church of Christ, being founded on the rock of eternal truth, can never be in danger. All the powers of Rome and hell can never prevail against her. Whenever God's truth breaks forth, and honest men have liberty to preach it, the devil's and the Pope's kingdom will be in terrible danger; then, everything else in divine worship will be set at nought, which *hath no support* in God's word. God sent the gospel of his Son into the world, not to enrich the clergy, but to convert souls; and to reform the world, which is the visible design of that godlike institution.

But, *sixthly*, what was likely to be the further consequence of Paul's preaching the sincere and uncorrupted gospel? *The temple of the great goddess DIANA would be despised, and her magnificence destroyed, whom all the world worshipped*. (v. 27.)

When Churchmen's sinful gains are in danger, they cry, *the Church is in danger!* And again, being their only godliness, the chief idol they

\* Now about a hundred and fifty years ago.—EDITOR.



worship, it is very true, that *their* Church and religion are in danger enough, if the gospel be but honestly preached.

But is it not a wicked craft, to bring down God and heaven, to espouse the cause of unrighteousness and deceit? Yet furious priests will press heaven and earth in defence of their forgeries and superstitions; nor part with a tittle, a shrine or ceremony to save a soul.

There was certainly something divine in Paul and his doctrine, which put the whole tribe of Pagan priests into such a fright. The Temple of the Lady at Loretto, and all other Popish *toyshops*, would soon be despised, and the magnificence of the prelates humbled, if the gospel and truth had but fair play.

Let us inquire, *seventhly*, what effect this *craftsman's* sermon had upon the auditory? *They were full of wrath.*—(v. 28.)

The holy tribe were stark-mad, to hear that their trade and their idol were both in danger. Hot sermons have usually violent effects upon a blind and bigoted assembly, while wise and calm hearers see the absurdities and weakness of the discourse, and despise the passion, and perhaps the villany of the preacher. But when the blind lead the blind, the *wilfully* blind lead the *unfortunately* blind, the issue will be endless blindness.

WHAT is the cry? "*Great is DIANA of the Ephesians!*"

In Jewish language, "*the Temple, the Temple, the Temple!*"

In Popish language, "*the Virgin, the Virgin, the Virgin!*"

In High Church language, "*the Kirk, the Kirk, the Kirk!*"—"the Church, the Church, the Church."

As the Author referred to observes, such is the power of delusion and false zeal, that let but a priest point at a windmill, and cry, *the Church is falling*, and his congregation will venture their brains to stop the sails.

What a pity souls should be thus cheated!

*The whole city was in an uproar.*—(v. 29.)

What mischief is one fiery priest, one passionate sermon able to do!

This is not the way of Christ and Christian preachers. When men contend for God and truth, they do it calmly, as knowing a good cause will support itself.

But error, conscious of its own weakness, flies for support to rage, violence, and confusion.

*They rush into the theatre.* How oft do noise and clamour run down sacred truth, which loves calmness and order. For two hours nothing is heard but "*Great is DIANA of the Ephesians.*"—(v. 34.)

Paul and his Protestant dissenting brethren could not get in a word amongst them. Be a cause ever so good, rage and fury are ill methods to support it; the wrath of man never promoteth the righteousness of God. Wrath, clamour, bitterness, are of quite a differing nature from reasoning and gospel persuasion. These passions only serve the cause of the enemy who raiseth them.

*Eighthly*, and lastly, how is this ecclesiastical mob dispersed, and this tumult appeased, which these Church toy makers had raised?

It is done by the prudence and moderation of a sensible LAYMAN,\* the

\* This is the secret of a complete reformation.—EDITOR.

town clerk, or register of the games, who talks to better purpose than the whole convocation of priests.—(v. 35.)

He telleth them this worship was *established by law*, and had a *majority* on its side.—(v. 35, 36.)

And then, had it been a *Moloch* or a *Maypole*, it would have had the knavish priests on its side, and must have been worshipped. And if the priests *say* it, the people will fall down, though it be to a wooden cross, or a decayed stone on the highway, or a worm-eaten image, or a mouldy wafer.

To humour the people he (the town clerk) owns it to be the *image that fell down from Jupiter*. So the Romish priests say the Chapel of the Virgin at Loretto, was carried by angels from the Holy Land into Italy. All the lumber of the Popish priests came from God; yet they are scared out of their wits, if men offer to take it from them, as if God could not defend his own gifts. He tells them that Paul had not *robbed* their temples, or blasphemed their goddess. (v. 37). For knavish tricks, and foul language only hurt the cause of God and truth. Urging the conscience with argument, and moving the heart by persuasion, are the weapons of Christ's workmen. He tells Demetrius and the priests, that "the *Court of Common Pleas* is open, if they have any charge against Paul." (v. 38.) But the misfortune is, the cause of image worship and Church fopperies will not bear a fair trial.

### III.

## STATESMEN'S RELIGION.

**"EVERY PLANT WHICH MY HEAVENLY FATHER HATH NOT PLANTED  
SHALL BE ROOTED UP."**—(Matt. xv. 13.)

In those who think a National Church right, Dissent is a sin; in those who think it wrong, silence is a shame.

---

### MAZZINI AND ITALY.\*

For weeks England has been in a strange state of agitation. Multitudes have gathered together in London, Birmingham, and Manchester, and made the welkin ring with their huzzahs. And for what did their cries of rejoicing ascend? It was because a true hero had come among them: a man whom, in the hour of his country's need, Providence had led forward, and declared the leader of the Hungarians into the promised land of freedom; a man magnanimous in prosperity, and whose true greatness was never fully developed until he had tasted the bitterness of exile, and passed his hours with his Bible and his Shakespeare in the gloomy fortress of Kutayah. Yet the homage which England paid that noble man, was far from being man worship. Englishmen welcomed him, because in Louis Kossuth was personified the struggle of freedom to unloose the chains which absolutism had bound around her; and because they wished it to ring in the ears of tyrants, that the sympathies (and that includes much) of a free and powerful people were with suffering humanity,—wherever "man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn."

At such a time it may not be useless to endeavour to recall some attention to the claims of Italy, and to remind the people of England that one man lives among them worthy to stand side by side even with the Governor of Hungary; and that to the oppressed and exiled Italians the name of Joseph Mazzini is as dear as that of Louis Kossuth to the betrayed and defeated Hungarian. The aim of these two men is the same. They wish to give independence to their native land: a desire which has a peculiar claim to the attention and help of Englishmen.

It is a painful fact, however, that many who deeply sympathize with the fate of Hungary, take little interest in the Italian cause. This, we believe arises from two causes,—from ignorance and from misrepresentation. For if as patriots and Protestants we fully realized the importance of the Italian struggle, and knew the honourable character of the men who conduct it, our hands would be extended to aid, and our voices raised to animate and comfort. But although publications, valuable and elo-

\* "Royalty and Republicanism in Italy." By Joseph Mazzini. London: Charles Gilpin, 5, Bishopsgate Without.

quent, have been put forth to enlighten us on these very topics, as a nation we are sadly ignorant of the merits of the case. One thing we especially deplore. That part of the religious public have received as true, foul slanders uttered by the enemies of freedom against what may be truly called "the national party of Italy." And no single person belonging to that party is held in greater abhorrence than the patriotic, the talented, the religious Joseph Mazzini.

Trinal speaks truly, when he says, "the religious are not necessarily the good, though the fully good are necessarily the religious." Paid slanderers call the brave Italians Socialists and Communists, Revolutionists and Infidels; and, instead of demanding proof, we are overcome by the enormity of the charges, and refuse them that sympathy which their foes tremble lest we should give.

Is this right? Is this consistent with the noble manliness of the English character? No; and we firmly believe this inconsistency will not long continue. It is impossible that a people which has suffered and bled in the defence of its rights against the tyranny of usurped power, should not sooner or later awaken to active sympathy with a nation which, for fifty years, has heroically struggled to obtain all that is most sacred in this world,—independence; a recognized existence without, and freedom of thought and action within. And it is impossible that a serious people, calling itself religious, and having for many years written in the first page of its gospel of life, the inviolability of conscience as its highest law, should not comprehend the European importance of the Italian movement, and feel the breath of God sanctifying and giving soul to the enterprise of twenty-four millions of men, whose political revelation,—thanks to Rome,—must be religious. Indifference in such a case is more immoral than antagonism. The one may be the fruit of error; the other is Atheism. Such are the opinions of Mazzini, at least.

Here the question arises, what is the specific aim of the national party in Italy? To this Mazzini gives answer, in his address to the priests of Italy, on the Encyclica of Pope Pius the Ninth.

"We desire to reunite the twenty-four millions of men who people the land of Italy into a single family, under a single law, under the shadow of a single banner. We desire to continue the tradition of our fathers, and to open to our sons a path upon which they will not meet exile, the gibbet, or the bâton of the Croat soldier. We desire that for the benefit of humanity, our intellect may be free, that our word may be free, and our work powerful. We desire not to *worship falsehood, but truth*; we invoke an authority, but an authority founded upon the interpretation of the law, not upon an usurping and arbitrary will; we seek guides and chiefs, but we seek them amongst the chosen in intellect and virtue,—amongst the most devoted and the best; we ask for the food of the soul—education for all; the bread of the body, work for all; that 'thy will may be done, O Lord, on earth as it is in heaven!'"

Is there anything wrong in these desires? On the contrary, are they not worthy of all praise? Could man bestow his faculties on a cause more glorious?

When these wishes shall have become realities,—when the blighting curse of the Popedom shall have been overthrown, and Italia be the land

of freedom, instead of bondage, few names will be cherished more dearly by Protestants than that of the now exiled Mazzini. But there is one charge which, strange to say, has alienated many minds from Mazzini and his party—they are republicans.

Now, in itself this is not a sin. Some, by the abhorrence they display when they speak of republicanism, seem to imply that in their opinion, a republican must be the enemy of all social order, of all law for the security of life and property, and a bitter hater of the Christian religion. Some, on the other hand, think that order, security, and Christianity may be enjoyed; nay, they say they are enjoyed in the United States of America. Even monarchist historians have admitted that republicanism, when not a mere governmental theory, originating in the brain of one man or of several men, but the offspring of tradition and the exponent of the vital conditions of society, may be preferable even to monarchy.

Thus, it seems, a republic may be a good or a bad thing, according to time and place. And let us remark, in addition, that Mazzini does not solicit us to renounce our limited monarchy: all he wishes is, that Italy should become a republic. Though by principle a republican, yet he holds that the fact of a thing's being true in principle, does not give the right of suddenly enthroning it in practice. He constantly reiterates "conviction brings with it the duty of a peaceful apostolate; it does not create the right to realize in application."

While agreeing, then, that governments cannot, with advantage, be immediately changed; that they should spring from the very heart of the people, from the history, the education, the social organization, the habits of society, the question meets us—is, then, Mazzini a wise statesman, or a wild dreamer, in devoting his powers to establish a republic in Italy?

Few who have read the debates of our own St. Stephen's, can have failed to notice how frequently, when some change is being discussed, our constitutional statesmen appeal to the book of history. Most prudent men commend them for thus acting. If English statesmen, then, may draw their wisdom from English history, surely Italian statesmen may, for a like purpose, read their country's history. And what does Italian tradition say respecting monarchy and aristocracy? It shows that in no respect have they tended to develop the national resources. They have supplied no vital element to Italian strength, or to the future unity of the people. The history of Italian royalty commences with the downfall of its liberties, and it is identified with servitude and dismemberment.

The nobility have done nothing to gain the affections of the people; they have never stood forward in behalf of the nation, but have leagued themselves with the foreigner or with clerical absolutism.

Now let us turn to the democratic element; and here we shall permit Mazzini to speak. He says—

"In Italy the initiative of progress has always belonged to the people. It is through her communes that she has acquired all she has ever had of liberty; through her workmen in wool or silk, through her merchants of Genoa, Florence, Venice, and Pisa, that she has acquired her wealth; through her artists—plebeian and republican—from Giotto to Michael Angelo, that she has acquired her renown; through her navigators—

plebeian—that she has given a world to humanity ; through her Popes—sons of the people even they—that until the twelfth century she aided in the emancipation of the weak, and sent forth a word of unity to humanity. All her memories of insurrection against the foreigner are memories of the people. All that has made the greatness of our towns, states, almost always from a republican epoch,—the educational book. The only book read by the inhabitant of the Alps or the Transteverin, who can read, is an abridgement of the ‘ History of the Ancient Roman Republic.’ ”

Among a people like that, where the aristocracy is not respected, and where around the people is a halo of glory, of strength, and of dignity,—where royalty inspires neither affection nor obedience, is it possible to organize a constitutional monarchy? In 1848 this was tried under Charles Albert, with what result is well known. Were further vindication needed, the language of the republican party itself supplies the need. They say, “ let the nation arise ; let her make herself mistress of her own territory ;—then, the victory once gained, let her freely decide who shall reap the fruits. Monarch or people, we will submit ourselves to the power she herself shall organize.”

Englishmen ! never more utter slander against these men. In the Italian struggle there are three questions which should powerfully influence our countrymen. The question of principle, the political, and the religious question. The first appeals to every heart. A sister kingdom is suffering : the best and bravest of her living sons are in exile and in prison. Many that added glory to her name, died fighting for her freedom. Moans are heard throughout the land. Tyrants trample upon every right that man holds dear. Pale horror sits on every face, but those of the despots and their tools. A feeling as of suffocation is felt by all ; paralyzing every energy, and repressing every noble aspiration.

Men of England, shall twenty-four millions of men be robbed of their liberties, trampled in the dust, murdered as occasion calls for, to delight monsters, while we stand cool spectators of the hellish crimes? The day when this can be said of Englishmen will never come, we hope ; but should it, then truly hath the glory departed, and the sooner they crouch as suppliants at the feet of the Czar, the better it will be for humanity. Why is it the few can thus butcher the many? Is it because the Italians know not how to assert, and, if need be, defend their rights? It is not. But because the powerful tyrants of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, (should we add France?) and the petty things which occupy Italian thrones have sworn to aid each other in exterminating every cry for freedom, and to nourish the earth with the blood of the man that refuses to wear the yoke of bondage.

“ And what of England—is *she* steeped so low  
In poverty, crest fallen, and palsied so,  
That we must sit much wroth, but timorous more,  
With murder knocking at our neighbours door?  
Not murder, masked and cloaked, with hidden knife,  
Whose owner owes the gallows life for life,  
But *public murder*, that with pomp and gaud,  
And royal scorn of justice, walks abroad  
To wring more tears and blood than e’er were wrung,  
By all the culprits justice ever hung !”

Let the heart of each one answer, and in the name of the Highest let us aid, in the way best suiting each, our brethren now trodden in the dust.

Upon the balance of power-question, however important it may be, we will not enter, but turn at once to the question important to every living soul, the overthrow of the Papacy. The very essence of the battle-cry of the Italians is liberty of conscience. The abolition of the temporal power evidently draws with it the emancipation of men's minds from the spiritual authority. The principle of liberty of thought and action, which the Constituent Assembly, elevated into a living, active right, tended rapidly to destroy the absolutist dogma, which from Rome aims more than ever to enchain the universe.

Did England see this? Hear Mazzini—"England has understood nothing of this. She has not understood what there was of sublime and prophetic in the cry of emancipation; in this protestation in favour of human liberty, issuing from the very heart of ancient Rome in the face of the Vatican. She has not felt that the struggle in Rome was to cut the Gordian knot of moral servitude, against which she has long and vainly opposed her Bible Societies, her Christian and Evangelical alliances; and that there was being opened, had she but extended a sisterly hand to the movement, a mighty pathway to the human mind."

It may not yet be too late to come to a knowledge of these things. Reader, when you reflect how the Papacy condemned science in Galileo; philosophy, in Giordano Bruno; religious aspiration in John Huss and Jerome, of Prague; political life, by an anathema against the rights of the people; civil life, by Jesuitism, the terrors of the Inquisition, and the example of corruption; the life of the family, by confession turned into a system of espionage, and by division introduced between father and son, brother and brother, husband and wife,—do you not feel that every sacrifice should be made by you to overthrow the awful system? And in no way can you work more efficiently for this purpose than by aiding and co-operating with the National party of Italy. By this we do not mean that you should run to arms, and march to the battle-field. No; we mean that you should organize a vast agitation for the political and religious independence of the peoples; and say to your government that honour, duty, and the future of England demand that the doctrine of non-interference should be carried out; that while we ourselves should not interfere with the internal arrangements of any people, we should take care that neither Russia, France, nor Austria did.

Here we may state that a society, called the "Society of the Friends of Italy," already exists. It numbers many of the best friends of humanity, both in England and Scotland. The general office is 10, Southampton Street, Strand, London. Upon application to which all necessary information will be thankfully given.

Before we conclude, there is another duty to perform. To commend to your notice, reader, the book we have placed at the beginning of this paper. In it you will find a succinct account of the terrible struggle of 1848, with a clear exposition of the hopes and position of Italy. It is a work which all may study with advantage. Political questions it handles as only a first-rate statesman could handle; and religious ones are treated of by a man strong in faith and full of Christian love. Its literary merit

is of the highest order. The thoughts are valuable, and most eloquently expressed. Every page bears the mark of a mind burning to express its patriotic and religious ideas. We know no work which more powerfully witnesses against the falsehood and tyranny of the Papacy. Our religious societies should circulate it everywhere, and use it as a lever to overthrow the great obstacle to the progress of Christianity. Does not the following extract fully express what our ministers of the gospel think of the Papacy. It is the conclusion of a letter to the priests of Italy :—

“ We again repeat these words to the priests of Italy, with a deep sense of affection and hope. May God enlighten them for the sake of the country, and for the sake of the Church. May he awaken in them faith in works, holy hopes, the charity which transforms the languor of unbelieving souls into the fever of life. The Church is Cæsar’s, let them return it to God. The hierarchy is changed into a parasitical plant, consuming the life of an institution destined to enlarge and raise itself with humanity. Let them uproot it, and let them renew the institution in the election, and in the inspirations of the people. The word of Jesus is destroyed, betrayed, sacrificed to the falsehoods of *those who call themselves the princes of the earth*; let them re-establish it in honour. Humanity thirsts after progress, and faith after an authority freely erected and obeyed; and the Pope replies, *immobility and passive obedience*. To the council, to the council. The Church shall furnish another answer.”

Again, in “ the first lines of the gospel, the evil spirit offers Jesus dominion over the kingdoms and principalities of the earth, provided that he will serve him and betray his mission. Jesus, despising him, refuses. When you see the heads of your hierarchy leaguings with princes, cursing the people for them, and shedding its blood, in order to preserve for themselves a portion of Italian land, does that page of the gospel never recur to your minds? In another page Jesus, the gentlest, meekest, and most loving spirit that has descended upon earth, armed himself with a scourge, and, in the impulse of holy indignation, chased the traffickers from the temple. Do you never think of that page, my brothers? Is the temple now free from buyers and sellers? The Pharisees—the sectaries of the dead letter; have they all disappeared? Does the word of God shine pure and life-giving, as when it was spoken by Jesus?”

Men and brethren, let us aid in regenerating this fearful house of sin and blood. In opposing the Papacy, we should be fighting, not against religion, but the mask of religion. As Christians, are we not summoned to the warfare. Truth points to the power of Rome, deliberately violating the divine law and says there is evil, and must be combatted. And whoever neglects to do so, through egotism or sloth, is guilty. Who serves evil, abandons the cause of God, the *only Lord*. And who is not for him, is against him.



#### IV.

### SCEPTICS' RELIGION.

*Under this department, sceptical objections, and systems or principles advocated as hostile to Christianity, are dispassionately considered.*

---

#### THE DISPATCH OF CANT.

MR. THOMAS CARLYLE, the illustrious and erratic author of many works, and the inventor of more words, has of late been indulging in a trip to the moon, mounted on his grey goose quill; and the result is the second biography of the late John Sterling, which the *Dispatch*, by a happy and profound combination of words, calls "sterling coin." This felicitous joke heads an article under the title "History and Politics," and is followed by a very smart attack on Balaam's ass, which the editor belabours most unmercifully, since he mistakes it for one of the fundamental articles of the Christian faith, or at least one of the incomprehensible mysteries of Christian theology.

Between Balaam's ass and Jonah's whale, the gospel seems in a very critical position; for we all understand these to be the pillars of our faith; we could almost suspect that the writer of the article in question, had received some personal affront from the Christian religion, for which he takes severe revenge, in a critique on the life of a man who was not worthy of two biographies.

We have nothing to do here with the sentiments into which Carlyle has fallen, in his life of Sterling, these have been admirably exposed in an article in the *Times*, which has subjected that paper to nearly equal disgrace with Christianity itself.

The following hot, furious, and cloudy effusion, issued from the Liberal weekly organ, on Sabbath morning, November 16th, 1851.

---

#### THOMAS CARLYLE'S "STERLING COIN."

"Another recruit to the army of *honest* authorship! Yea, a volunteer—an individual contingent to the muster-roll of truth, worth a whole army of *Bulcalfs* and *Pearmains*. Thomas Carlyle has fairly *come out from among the mass of those who stand as coward mutes*. He has *come to suspect* that "he who lets falsehood live, helps on the lie." He will not suffer the *hypocrite and the fanatic* to thrive upon the simple by the silence of the intelligent. He *stalks forth* from the fastness of his study, and *belabours all lusty shams* until they *roar* again. The act is doubtless daring, *magnanimous, heroic*. The man lives by his pen. His

books sell well, and have the sterling ring about them, which steady calls for new editions indicate. Yet he perils all this, risks expulsion from the eden of boudoir and the paradise of the drawing-room, *dares the world* to withdraw him from its literary custom and gain-giving good will, and with chivalrous martyr-spirit, calls aloud and spares not, prophetically, and from the altitudes of duty, speaking the truth that is in him, it is time *that a voice crying in this wilderness of life*, should say to all builders of baseless fabrics and castles in the air, "repent ye!" The message of truth has come to Carlyle; and with genuine self-sacrificing, fearless apostleship, he hastens on his way, to tell *what he has been told*. The act is a note-worthy social phenomenon. While women are getting rid of the petticoats, because they gather mud and impede locomotion, here is a man *shaking his soul out of its mythologies and antiquated useless spiritual garments*, and striving to convince mankind that they were *better to go spiritually naked than to hug round them the fantastic rags which time and habit have taught them to admire and feel warm in*. The writer of this book calls it, the "Life of John Sterling." We call it the *Death of Theological Cant*. The mass of reviewers have blinked the polemical part of the work to praise the narrative—a strong symptom this of *their secret sympathy* with opinions they *dare not praise*, and will not condemn. The *Times* alone, to avoid the rheum of its grudge at the Author for what it calls "a breach of confidence," creditable to all parties concerned, sinks the biography to bother the biographer with a diarrhoea of modern balderdash. It is a note-worthy circumstance that *this Pecksniff alone*, of all the pilots of the press, continues the "dodge" which others are silently giving up from sheer disgust of the work, and is "shocked" in the most becoming manner, and reads the world "a great moral lesson" with all the unction of "the best of all possible instructors." To the Pharisee stomach, we can well understand that such meat as this new cook sets before it, will be neither palatable, masticable, nor digestible. "*Hear what the spirit saith unto the Churches*." The world is "overclouded to the zenith and nadir of it, by incredible, *uncredited*, traditions, solemnly sordid hypocrisies, and beggarly deliriums, old and new." The learned professions "are built largely on speciosity, instead of performance, so clogged, in this bad epoch, and defaced under such suspicions of *fatal imposture*, that they are hateful, not loveable, to the young radical soul, scornful of gross profit, and intent on ideals and human nobleness." Worst of all are the parsons, established and dissenting, "those legions of 'black dragoons,' of all varieties and purposes, who patrol with horse meat and man's meat this afflicted earth, so hugely to the detriment of it." The cause of quarrel with, and scornful contempt for, these is thus indicated by implication—"what the light of your mind, which is the direct inspiration of the Almighty, pronounces incredible, that, in God's name, leave uncredited; at your peril, do you try believing that." *Orthodoxy, to this true man, is a "sham" and "cobweb"*—"bottled moonshine." What to the deluded have appeared "all manner of sublimely illuminated places," have, "for the basis of them, only putridity, artificial gas, and quaking bog." In very truth, "*the old spiritual highways and recognized paths to the eternal, are all torn up and flung in heaps, sub-*

*merged in unutterable boiling mud, oceans of hypocrisy and unbelievability, of brutal living atheism, and damnable, dead, putrescent cant; darkness, and the mere shadow of death, enveloping all things from pole to pole; and in the raging gulf currents offering us will-o'-the-wisps for load-stars—intimating that there are no stars, nor ever were, except certain old Jew ones, which have now gone out.*" Of course our decorous contemporary is *decently* and piously shocked at all this. It represents its name in its spirit—it is the *Times*, and not a day *beyond* the times—it is the ignorant *present* time," not the future tense in any thing. With a serious assumption of faith and devoutness, and a holy horror of the sceptic, *its chief quarrel with Carlyle is, that he is too much in earnest—that he is such a thorough believer in truth*, in its value, in the fact that there are realities that are worth believing—that he cannot rest quiet in the easy chair of current speciosities so as to suffer facts to be confounded with fancies, and the real to be clouded and lost in the ideal and the make-believe. When in the genuine spirit of a prophet, *who has a God's message to deliver and obey*, Thomas exclaims, "religion is not a doubt," the organ of the priest and Levite retorts that he had "for his unvarying object to make it nothing but a doubt, the most dismal, distressing, and hopelessly perplexing." The source of this antagonism of view is not far to seek. Carlyle means that nothing which is, as he terms it, an "unbelievability," can have any real bearing upon religion. *The Times again, obviously, and in company with its patrons of the parson world, means that if we have not faith in the incredible and the contradictory, we can have no religion.* In fact, it is the fallacy of the *fanatics* to confound their *theology* with religion; and it is the aim (and God speed him, *say we*) of *doughty* Thomas, to prove *that myths, fables, and stories, have smothered and hidden religion out of sight*; and that until we have cleared away the "unbelievabilities and dead putrescent cant," it is not possible that religion can be seen, but very possible that it may be throttled and strangled by being confounded with the monstrous and incredible inventions with which it has been identified by the hypocrisy, ignorance, and credulity of mankind. Carlyle acts but as the "Old Mortality" of true religion. He wanders among the memorials of a genuine faith, to clear the inscriptions of God's truth of the moss and rubbish of human fancy and men's device; and the hoary sextons, who live upon disease and death, cry out upon him for desecrating holy ground, by clearing the canker and corrosion of time *from the tables of eternal truth*, and removing the crumbling monuments of human history from "*the fountain of living water*," that it may "*spring up unto everlasting life*!" Of course the man who could dare to say of the three learned professions, that there is not one which does not "require you at the threshold to constitute yourself an imposter," *must expect* to be assailed with unmeasured imputations of uncharitableness—but let him be of good cheer—the professions are casting down their idols with their own hands, and confessing their own charlatanism.

The priest calls the lawyer a cheat,  
And the lawyer be-knaves the divine.

There is not a *barrister* who addresses a jury, who is not conscious that he is stating what he does not believe, and acting a part which is

not genuine—suppressing here—colouring there—misleading witnesses into involuntary contradiction—and bamboozling every body to gain a verdict. This is no vulgar prejudice, but a sober fact,—avowed by Lord Brougham as actually the duty of a counsel—acted on by Phillips—and justified by all whose trade it is to “make the worse appear the better reason.” The physician, if he be sincere, tells you that he is an impostor—that he gives pills, and draughts, and powders, to earn his fee, and *not to further the cure*—that patients require to be cheated—that without humbug there can be no practice—and that patients insist on being deceived. *Parsondom alone can only save its credit for sincerity at the expense of its understanding.* For our part, *uncharitable as we may be called*, we cannot help thinking with Carlyle, that Egyptian Magi, Roman Augurs, and Popish priests, are not the only impostors among the “black dragoons.” There are in round numbers 50,000 parsons, professors of theology, in these realms—the *best educated, and in some respects, necessarily the ablest and most thinking members of society.* They say “that there *are* no stars, nor ever were, except certain old Jew ones,” and we say that we do not believe that *they* believe this. The real sceptics, the true infidels, are *those who* assert there is no religion, *unless an ass became a prophet*—and no Christianity unless the *conjuring tricks* of Moses and Aaron were realities—and no true faith unless three are one, and one is three, and contradictions and impossibilities are certain and facts. In an age of inquiry, intelligence, and insight, these “old Jew stars” *will* shine no longer, and, if there can be no light without them, then the world will certainly be in darkness. But the soul *is* immortal—there is a God, the Father and friend of all—there is truth, and heaven, and an everlasting futurity—and these solemn and consoling veracities are *not the less significant*, real, and enduring, *because the whale did not swallow Jonah, and Balaam’s ass did not speak.* Carlyle is striving betimes so to order human belief, that the Christian religion shall survive *its mere mythologies* and childish historical incrustations, and it is the duty of all earnest and *well-ordered* devout minds to help him. Let priests, parsons, and all men, then begin by taking to heart these golden words, “what the light of your mind, *which* is the direct inspiration of the Almighty, pronounces incredible, that, in God’s name, leave uncredited; at your peril do not try believing that”—for he who begins by striving to credit what is incredible, will end by doubting that which is true.”

---

In commenting on this wonderful effusion, we cannot but compliment the Editor, on the clearness of his position, every one may see by reading, what he accounts extraneous mythology, namely, all “*unbelievabilities*,” and all will believe him; for none profess to believe or advocate such things.

The perspicuity of this wondrous article, is further manifest, in the plainness with which the *believabilities* are indicated; being all that we can see by the light of our own minds; which is the same as what we see by the light of our own eyes; that is, nothing at all.

Nor can we forbear congratulating our readers on the announcement,

of this seer of visions, no doubt "by the light of his own mind, *which is the direct inspiration of the Almighty*,"—THAT CANT IS DEAD!

Then we hope these inspired penmen will no longer *cant against cant*; but let it lie quietly in its grave: otherwise, we shall be apt to transpose our title into as felicitous an expression as Carlyle's "Sterling Coin;" and instead of the Dispatch of Cant, write over our lacubrations,—"*the Cant of the Dispatch*."

But if this antique personage be really deceased, his enemies should melt into a generous sorrow, whilst his friends should assume at least the decency of grief, and not dance at the funeral. The writer we have quoted, should not insult the ashes of his friend; the announcement ought to have been surrounded with a black border. Let all the muses weep for the beautiful adonis:—*Cant is dead*. Even Carlyle, whose huge teutonic word club, scattered the brains of the unfortunate, and thus put the critic into a flutter of confusion, was not aware of the extent of his achievements;—"the writer of this book, calls it the Life of John Sterling; we call it the death of theologic cant." Poor Carlyle, thou little thinkest what thou hast done! Thy occupation is gone; it was to cry down cant, and thou hast knocked him down dead, with thy murderous club, and now, what canst thou say or write more?

It is the wisdom and interest of the cat, to play with the last mouse, and not to kill it outright; since by this, pussy "risks expulsion from the eden of the boudoir, and the paradise of the drawing-room, with chivalrous martyrdom." Still "he *stalks forth* and belabours all lusty" mice, "till they" squeak "again:" the "act is doubtless daring, magnanimous, heroic;" since the cat lives by the mice,—directly or indirectly. The absence of vermin, is the loss of her occupation; other nuisances are her apology: just as the knight errant against cant, is dismissed when cant is dead. Success ruins his trade: he overshoots the mark by hitting it.

It may however be feared, that if the "Life of John Sterling" was the death of cant; the death of John Sterling, proved the resurrection of cant; and thus philosophically accounts for the appearance of the above criticism on "Sterling Coin."

But perhaps some further employment may be found for the club of this modern Hercules, in killing newspaper cant; for whilst the three professions of law, physic, and divinity, according to the Dispatch are filled by men who make a gain of "the hypocrite and fanatic," it is just *three to one* that editors are not particularly honest, and may, like lawyers, occasionally "suppress here, and colour there."

We do not see why "parsondom *alone* can only save its credit at the expense of its understandings;" *although* "the best educated, and, in some respects, necessarily the ablest and most thinking members of society."

For if "the *THREE learned* professions require you at the threshold to constitute yourself an impostor," what must we say of the unlearned profession, or the learned profession of weekly criticism? Shall we say that it "saves its credit at the expense of the" *reader's* "understanding," and so make a distinction of dishonesty?

"For our part, uncharitable as we may be called, we cannot help thinking with Carlyle, that Egyptian Magi, Roman Augurs, and Popish

priests, are *not the only* impostors," "who patrol with horse meat and man's meat, this afflicted earth;" though we have *never seen any* of the *four* learned professions, invading the province of costermongers and butchers' boys. It is only Mr. Carlyle and his critic, who understand this patrolling business.

Still, we must confess, the "force of" compliment "can no further go," than in this handsome recognition by the critic of his fellow labourers.

Even Carlyle is only a "*recruit*" to the cause of honesty, having "come out *from* the mass of those who stand as coward mutes," and therefore, but lately he stood amongst them; how lasting his late conversion may be, is left for the trial of experience; he has however "come to suspect," and may become suspicious of those who claim him, and in the eyes of "the coward mutes," whom he deserted but yesterday.

"The message of truth has come to Carlyle, and with *genuine* apostleship he *hastens* to tell what he has been told;" but he does not tell us *who told him*. This is the province of our genuine critic—"hear what the spirit saith unto the Churches!"—*what* spirit?—"the light of *your* mind, *which* is the direct inspiration of the Almighty!" The light of *whose* mind? Not any of the learned professions, but the light of the new Pope, the inspired and infallible Sham, who cries out against shams, as some persons would elude the police by crying stop thief.

This new way of knowledge, from direct inspiration, is the method of Swedenborg, and Joe Smith, and many other fanatics besides critics, and is a royal road to knowledge; only, unfortunately, it is an unbelievability to start with.

If there be any persons who imagine "there are no stars but certain old Jew ones, which have now gone out," their consolation is at hand in the kindling of the *Dispatch's* fire balloon, before which, sun, moon and stars will "hide their diminished heads."

This is the great light, and those who "assert there is no religion unless an ass became a prophet," will find their desire now fully gratified.

Unfortunately, even Balaam's ass never aspired to any such distinction: whether it spoke or not, we may judge, (*at least, as to its possibility,*) from those who speak now-a-days; and who imagine, that any others imagine, that Christianity rests on either Jonah or Balaam, and who *assume* that the miracles of Moses *were* conjuring tricks.

How competent this organ of public opinion is to deal with other questions,—offensively, hostilely, and unfairly stated, as "that three are one, and one is three; may be decided by some previous comments in the same paper; wherein it was stated, that men might be Christians without Trinitarianism, *because* Paul found some converts who had not even heard of the Holy Ghost: and yet were Christians! If the critic had read the account, before writing about it, he would have learned, that those *converts* were disciples of John the Baptist, and not Christians at all, any more than Balaam's ass was a prophet.

Accordingly we read that Paul made Christ known to them, told them of the Holy Ghost, and they were baptized in the name of Jesus, and receiving this spirit, *became* Christians.

Beforehand they knew no more of Christ, than of the Holy Ghost; and therefore were very notable Christians. (Acts xix. 1—6.)

This at least may serve to caution such men from dogmatizing on

Christianity, however certain they may be about their *own* "direct inspirations."

In another piece of criticism, in the same organ, we are told, "it is our creeds which curse and debase us. The popular faith is false, mean, Pagan. *Progress is only seen in infidelity, and atheism among masses of ignorance.* The only faith among us is baseless and bad. The press must prophesy, because the recognized prophets are false." But is not the press here aiding "the progress of infidelity and atheism among the masses of ignorance?"

These writers however, are much mistaken if they hope to hold a monopoly of the press, and equally mistaken if they suppose that their press is adapted to lead men into truths of the highest moment, by such hasty, burlesquing and slanderous articles, at once an insult to Christianity and to the learned professions.

And though as the critic concludes, it may be true, that "he who begins by striving to credit what is incredible [*i. e.* an impossibility,] will end by doubting what is true:" it is equally certain that he who begins by misrepresenting and rejecting what is true, will end by believing what is false.

---

## V.

# THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN NATURE.

*The Nature of Man as Spiritual, Immortal, and Responsible, will be the most frequent topic of this department: though sometimes we shall introduce MISCELLANEOUS Subjects.*

---

## THE GREAT CONTEST; THE BIBLE AGAINST TYRANNY.

No one who examines the signs of the times can be ignorant of the great struggle commenced and now going on, between despotism and liberty, in which the Bible and its free principles form one important element.

The despots, whether priests, dukes, or emperors, are jealous of the presence of Christ; but he is coming; and it is to be feared, that his second coming in the spirit of his gospel, may be to send a sword on the earth.

In our first number for 1852, we shall review the intimations of his coming, as conveyed by the present aspect of the various nations; in an examination of THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES; which, as we think, require the earnest examination of rulers and peoples; of all true men, whether as Christians, patriots, or citizens of the world.

As preparatory to this investigation, we beg their attention to the WAR UPON BIBLES in Florence; it is a significant fact, and applies to more places than Florence!

We shall first present this important case to our readers; and secondly, make a few brief observations upon the more prominent points in the narrative.

## "WAR UPON BIBLES IN FLORENCE.

---

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY NEWS.

"SIR,—Knowing that the journal which you so ably conduct has ever been, from its commencement to the present day, the firm and consistent advocate of civil and religious liberty, I send you a statement of a case of gross injustice and abuse of power, as exercised against two highly respectable persons, natives of Florence; sincerely trusting that the narrative, which is strictly correct, and shall be as succinct as possible, may be deemed by you worthy of a place in your columns, and may, through your aid, enlist the feelings and sympathies of the English public, and, by the expression of those feelings, deter the Tuscan government from acting towards its subjects in a manner so intolerant, unjust,



*and unchristian.* On the 17th of August last, at about 7½ p. m., a visit was made by the police to the house of a certain Francesco Madiai, No. 4,378, Piazza Santa Maria Novella, Florence. Madiai and his wife were both from home, but in their absence the house was searched from the roof to the cellars, and the object of the search revealed by the capture of two Bibles and an English book on a religious subject, the title of which I know not. Francesco Madiai, who had in the meantime come home, was then taken off to prison, in company with three other persons, who were in the house at the time of the arrival of the police awaiting the return of Madiai. One was Captain Arthur De Noi Walker, a gentleman who has known Madiai for several years, and had called that evening. Despite warm remonstrances on the part of all, they were marched off to prison, where Capt. Walker remained 22 hours, and was only eventually released through the exertions of his relations, and the strong representations made by the Hon. E. Bligh, Attaché to her Britannic Majesty's Legation at Florence—as *this case is already under the consideration of Lord Palmerston*, I shall not refer to it more fully. The other two men, Florentines, named Alessandro Fantoni, and Francesco Manelli, were detained in prison seven days and at the expiration of that time, without trial or even any cause assigned, offered their choice of indefinite imprisonment or indefinite banishment. They chose the latter, and are now severally at Geneva and Turin—their crime that of visiting the house of Madiai, and subsequently confessing the gospel, a man known to read his Bible and openly profess Protestantism. After an interval of twelve days Madiai's wife was also taken into custody and imprisoned.

“They both remain in prison in separate cells at the present time—their crime, *reading the Bible* and openly acknowledging it. At their examinations, which have been frequent, but hitherto conducted in private, and in the prison, they have boldly and consistently avowed themselves Protestants. Under these circumstances, it having been found difficult to frame a charge which would, if proved, entail a punishment upon this persecuted couple sufficiently severe to satisfy the rancour—for it would be a misnomer to call it justice—of their persecutors—*fresh charges have been made against the man, of endeavouring to proselytize (in this country a very serious accusation,) and his wife of keeping a house for immoral purposes.* Now, this latter charge is so *diabolical*, and one that militates so entirely against the whole course of this poor woman's past life, and one that will doubtless be attempted to be proved by *false swearing, subornation*, and all the iniquitous modes which are, alas, in this country, so readily at hand, and so largely and frequently made use of, that her only hope of escaping the wiles of her enemies, and proving her innocence, is by appealing to those friends and patrons who, in years gone by, have valued and befriended her. Prior to her marriage to Francesco Madiai, a man of most excellent character, and known to many English families as a trustworthy courier, Rosina Pulini, such was her maiden name, passed many years in England in the capacity of *femme de chambre*. I have now on my writing table, certificates of character from several ladies, all of which testimonials are worded in the most sincere and almost affectionate terms. They embrace many,

many years of Rosina Pulini's life with Lady C——. She lived sixteen years—sincerely do I hope that these lines may meet the eye of Lady C——, of Lady C—— T——, and others, who have known and attested to the worth of this excellent, persecuted woman; and can give unanswerable proofs of her amiable disposition, and pure and irreproachable private character. Sincerely do I hope that they will exert themselves, making applications in the proper quarter, and thus endeavour to avert the impending ruin and destruction of an upright and innocent woman. The case is urgent. As many of our readers may be unwilling to believe that such persecutions can exist in a Christian country during the 19th Century, I shall conclude my letter by sending you a list of those who have, during the last five months, been imprisoned or banished for reading the Bible, or for having a copy of it in their possession—a book which, notwithstanding all assertions to the contrary, I confidently affirm to be interdicted. On May 7, 1851, were arrested the Conte Piero Guicciardini, Cesare Magrini, Teken Betti, Labatini, Bursieri, Carlo Solieri Guiseppe Guerra, and Angelo Guarducci. After an imprisonment of ten days, numerous private examinations taking place in the prison, *but no public prosecution*, and the consequent means of stating their case being afforded them, these men were condemned to six months' residence in the Maremma, almost certain death during the summer and autumn; the following day, however, they were informed that their punishment had been commuted to six months' banishment from their native land—their crime, which was officially stated to them and published, was that of being found assembled and occupied in reading a chapter of the gospel of St. John, contained in the Deodati edition of the Bible. The Conte Guicciardini is now in England; of the others some are in Piedmont, some at Malta.

"On May the 8th, Hypolyto Liquozzi was taken into custody on suspicion of reading the Bible—his house was searched, but no Bible found. Notwithstanding this he was imprisoned eight days, and underwent three examinations. Towards the latter part of the month of August, Pasquale Cassaci was taken into custody, and still remains in prison. *His own wife betrayed him at the CONFESSIOAL*, stating his being in the habit of reading the Bible; his house was searched three times, but nothing found, not even a Bible. The charges against him, as against the Madiat, *are heresy and impiety*. Casacci is well known and highly respected in Florence, having been for 27 years employed by the Post-office as a general deliverer. *There are doubtless many more victims*, but I give you merely the names and cases of those with which I am personally acquainted, and for the truth of which I myself can answer. I sincerely trust you will not refuse publication to this letter, *as through publicity can we alone hope for any amelioration of the present lamentable state of things*. You can hardly imagine the avidity with which the English journals are perused in Italy, especially those which, like the *Daily News*, are conducted conscientiously and consistently, free from venality, corruption, or base truckling to the powers that be.

"I remain, Sir, with great respect, yours,

"Florence, Oct. 10.

"HUMANITAS."

## (TRANSLATION.)

"The following is the translation of the act of accusation against Casacci:

"The Tribunal of the First Instance, Florence.—In the matter of Pasquale Casacci.

"Whereas, notwithstanding the accused, Pasquale Casacci, denies having abandoned the Catholic faith, there are *not wanting in the trial reasons for believing that he also had made himself an apostate*, not only by his habitual and heretical blasphemies, and by the hatred that he has manifested against the pontiff and the catholic clergy, as Filippo Spiombi and Eugenio Silli depose, but because his apostacy is attested also by *public opinion*, as is gathered from the depositions of Guiseppe Paoletti, of Eugenio Silli, of the Father Silvio, Carmelite, and of Guiseppe Donnini.

"Whereas, it follows, moreover, from the joint deposition of Sabina Bonvicini, of the Father Silvio, of the Sazyenini, man and wife, and of Guiseppe Donnini, that Casacci *has instigated his own son to abandon the Catholic faith*, teaching him that there is no hell; that he made him copy tracts against the Catholic religion, and because he once refused struck him; that he has used cruelties even against his own wife, because they would not follow his perverse principles.

"Whereas, the instigation that he has used towards his son is the *more blameable because the latter showed himself reluctant to follow his enormous principles, being of an age to avail himself of his own reason to regulate his own conscience*.

"Whereas, notwithstanding the instructions against the Catholic religion which Casacci used to give his son and wife, *have not, as far as appears received publicity, such a circumstance does not exempt him from penalty*, as the jurisprudence has established, in the interpolation of the 60th Art. of the law of the 30th Nov., 1786.—Cerotelli, Criminal Jurisprudence, word 'Blasphemy.'

"Whereas, considering the penalty established by the aforesaid article, the imputation urged against Casacci must be taken cognizance of and decided by the regal court of Florence.

"For these reasons it declares that there exist *sufficient proofs* to send to the public judgment Pasquale Casacci, in order that he may answer to the *crime of impiety* imputed to him; it declares its own incompetency to take cognizance of and to decide concerning such a charge, and decrees the transmission of the process to the Regal Procurator-General, at the Regal Court of Florence, for the further course of justice."

In this infamous series of public acts of despotism, we may mark out the following important points: first, it is a *crime* to read the Bible; man's inalienable right; as much as it is to breathe: secondly, it is a crime for a father to educate his son; the first duty of nature: thirdly, a lady of irreproachable life is destroyed by slander and perjury by the organs of public justice: fifthly, prosecutions are carried on privately, at the caprice of the public officers: sixthly, **CONFESSION IS EMPLOYED TO MAKE THE WIFE DESTROY HER OWN HUSBAND**, and thus a pretended religious ordi-

nance, is the instrument of poisoning the happiness of families, and subverting the ordinance of God in nature and Christianity : seventhly, this confession, *which they pretend is PRIVATE to the confessor*, is made a political engine of combined priestly and temporal tyranny : eighthly, the absence of evidence is no barrier to condemnation, suspicion and public opinion are enough : ninthly, which is worst of all, the pretence of conscience, and being of age to use his own reason, is given as *the son's defence against his father's instruction*, whilst the father's being "of age to use *his own reason*, to regulate his own conscience," IS NO DEFENCE AGAINST *the tyranny of Popish law !*

Thus do they insult God by pleading a son's conscience against his father's admonitions, whilst they trample the father's conscience under the heels of their sanctimonious and ungodly despotism.

What is it these tyrants fear ? IT IS THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE :—God's word and man's unfettered reason !

Under these circumstances, it is with great pleasure that we call the attention of our readers to a new movement of Protestantism, which whilst leaving individuals to follow their private views in other respects, promises to unite Protestants of all denominations in one general purpose, based on broad principles, and aiming at practical measures. We are glad to learn that many persons of influence are associated in the general society, whilst the great towns are forming local societies to act in concert ; and we trust that all Protestants will be united in this great cause, consistently with the principles laid down in the following circular :—

*London, Nov. 5, 1851.*

"AT a Meeting of the General Committee of the PROTESTANT ALLIANCE, held November 4th, 1851, at the CALEDONIAN HOTEL, ADELPHI, The EARL OF SHAFTESBURY in the Chair, the following Resolutions were unanimously adopted :—

I. That in the judgment of this Committee, the time has now fully arrived when the principles adopted at the formation of the Protestant Alliance, on the 25th June in the present year, should be brought before the Protestants of all parts of the British empire, with a view to their being carried effectually into operation ; both in regard to the discontinuance of Government favour to Popery, and to the promotion of Religious freedom in Roman Catholic countries.

II. That in relation to the former—the discontinuance of Government favour to Popery—it appears to be the most obvious duty, at the present moment, to propose to the country at large, an united appeal to the Legislature, for the repeal of the Maynooth Endowment Act of 1845, and that irrespectively of the general question of endowments, about which there is a difference of opinion among Evangelical Protestants, the following are among the grounds on which such an appeal may rest :—

1. That it appears, from the records of the Irish Parliament, that the annual grant to the Romish College of Maynooth, which had been first made by that body in 1795, was only pledged by the Act of Union to be continued for a term of twenty years ; which term expired in 1821 : that various other grants, similarly pledged for a like term, were gra-

dually discontinued between 1821 and 1830; and that the vote to Maynooth, though still proposed to Parliament by the Government, was always objected to, and seldom carried without a division.

2. That, in 1845, Sir Robert Peel, partly to terminate these annual discussions, but chiefly with a hope of conciliating the Romish priesthood in Ireland, proposed to Parliament to augment the annual allowance to Maynooth, and to charge it on the Consolidated Fund, thus obviating the necessity of an annual vote. The measure Sir R. Peel only succeeded in carrying, after encountering the strongest opposition, on the part of the people of Great Britain, that has ever been manifested to any similar proposal.

3. That the open and strong repugnance of the people to this endowment of Maynooth was manifested, at the general election of 1847, by the rejection of many Members of the House of Commons who had supported Sir R. Peel's measure; while that statesman's hope, that thus he had pacified Ireland, was proved to be ill-founded, by the tumults, seditious meetings, and all but open rebellion, which marked the summer of the following year.

4. That the subsequent and present conduct of the Romish bishops and priests of Ireland, has shown how vain was the hope of that statesman, that, by any measure short of the concession of absolute dominion, he could propitiate that ambitious priesthood: while, by abetting the grossest insults to the laws, the Government, and the Legislature, they have placed Great Britain in the humiliating position of appearing to pay tribute, through fear, to the agents and emissaries of a hostile power.

5. That there is no reason to doubt, that the repugnance of the people of England to the endowment of the Romish College of Maynooth is as deep and fervent as ever: and that it appears advisable at once to call forth an expression of this national feeling, in the hope that the Government and Legislature will no longer persist in training up, out of the funds of the nation, a priesthood, so many of whom are distinguished by turbulence and disloyalty: that, with the view, a Public Meeting be held in London, in the month of November, for the purpose of petitioning Parliament for the repeal of the Maynooth Endowment Act: and that it be recommended that similar Meetings be afterwards held, in the great towns of England and Scotland.

III. That in relation to the second great object of the Protestant Alliance—the promotion of religious freedom in Roman Catholic countries—the Committee are of opinion that it essentially comprehends as well the assertion or the rights of conscience to be enjoyed by the subjects of Popish Governments, as the vindication of the claim of British Protestants, resident in Papal countries, to possess the same amount of liberty of worship and of burial as is conceded to Romanists in Great Britain; and that this object in its two branches may be advanced in various ways, and especially in the following:

1. By earnest, though at the same time respectful and dignified, appeals to Governments which sanction or permit persecution; such appeals being accompanied or not, according to circumstances, by the exercise of the diplomatic influence of our country.

2. By enforcing on British Protestants the duty of holding out the hand of brotherhood to all those Christians who are persecuted for conscience sake in Popish countries; by affording pecuniary relief, where it is most needed, to the families of those who are cast into prison for religious causes; and by offering a refuge to those who are exiled for similar reasons.

3. By doing honour, as occasion offers, to Governments which, like the Piedmontese, up to the present time, protect liberty of conscience, and resist the exorbitant claims of the Romish priesthood.

4. By communicating with our fellow-Christians in the United States of America, and in the Protestant nations of continental Europe, with the view of concentrating, as far as possible, the public opinion and moral influence of the sound portions of Christendom upon all cases requiring united action.

IV. That while this Committee earnestly recommend the diligent prosecution of the objects of the Protestant Alliance, according to the plan sketched out in the foregoing Resolutions, they would keep before their own minds, and proclaim to all the members and friends of the Association, that the success of their enterprize entirely depends upon the blessing of God, sought by prayer through the One Mediator; and they would therefore call upon them to strengthen one another in the Lord for this great conflict, in the belief that, however formidable and inveterate an adversary it may be,—Popery is a doomed thing, and is hastening to its final overthrow.

JOHN MACGREGOR, *Hon. Sec.*  
RICHARD FAWKES, *Secretary.*

No. 9, SERJEANTS'-INN, FLEET-STREET, LONDON."

**CONTENTS, INDEX, AND TITLE PAGE**  
**OF**  
**THE BIBLE AND THE PEOPLE**  
**FOR 1851,**  
*Will be given with No. I, of the Bible and the People*  
**For 1852.**

---

We earnestly desire our readers to exert themselves to extend our circulation, confidently promising several new features of popular interest, whilst retaining the same general purpose.

## REVIEWS AND CRITICISMS.

---

*A Course of Lectures on the Rise, Progress, present Aspect, and Papal Development and Tendencies of Puseyism.* By JOHN POULTER. Northampton: printed for the Author.

MR. POULTER, the Author of "a Course of Lectures on Puseyism," is, we believe a Baptist minister at Northampton. The lectures have been delivered at various places, and are now presented to the public in a neat volume, that deserves, and we trust will obtain, an extensive circulation. They convey clearly and concisely much important information in connection with the history and nature of Puseyism, as well as many well-reasoned exposures to the sentiments passing under that modern title.

The point in which we regard Mr. Poulter's production as somewhat deficient is, in not sufficiently denouncing the system of which Puseyism is an established part; still he does plainly intimate the truth, that there is demanded a reform, in order to save the Church; and perhaps to the majority of readers, the Author's moderation in this respect will appear to be a wise and liberal prudence.

We should have preferred a strong chapter in conclusion, showing that PUSEYISM IS PRAYERBOOKISM. But we must allow to each his own peculiar style and method of performing his work. Mr. Poulter's Lectures will, we doubt not, meet with general approbation.

The reader will be amply repaid for the perusal of Mr. Poulter's Lectures, and should be in the hands of all thinking Christians; trusting that they will prove an antidote to Puseyism, and be the means of bringing many who are of a wavering mind to a settled conviction, that Puseyism is but Popery in a new phase.—[EDITOR.]

---

*Discourses on Various Forms of Religion.* By J. BURNS, D.D. London, Houlston & Stoneman.

THE eight discourses here presented to the reader's notice, embrace the following subjects:—a Religion by Proxy, a Religion of Ceremonies, a Religion of the Senses, the Religion of Feeling, the Religion of Credulity, and the Religion of Faith. We feel we are giving no mean praise, when we say they are worthy of Dr. Burns's, former fame. His is a name well known in the Churches, not as that of the leader of a sect, but as that of a talented and Catholic-hearted Christian. The Sermons here published were delivered in London during the time when the Great Exhibition was open—and of necessity were adapted to benefit a very mixed congregation, such as the Dr. had during that season. We think he has performed his work well; and the discourses now before us will repay the perusal of any one interested in these subjects. The style is exceedingly perspicuous, and the thoughts of the Author are delivered boldly and logically. We think some of the Baptist brethren would not be injured by studying his sayings upon the water question.



The third discourse is a most powerful one; though we confess that we differ from the Doctor most fundamentally in his treatment of the Deist. By putting the question at issue upon the ground he has done, in our humble judgment he gives the Deist an advantage which the latter knows well how to use. The Doctor contends, and we think truly, that neither the sublimity of the heavens nor the loveliness of earth, can teach us what virtue is. He then asks can this knowledge be attained by "the impression of the mind." "An impression of the mind means nothing at all; for it is from the impression of the mind that all sorts of wicked and absurd results have been produced; and therefore this tells nothing with any degree of certainty." To this sentence in its connection, we most decidedly object. In our opinion, the logical deductions which might be drawn from it would cut from beneath us the groundwork upon which morality rests.

We commend to the study of Dr. Burns the following sentence of a Chinese sage, who wrote six centuries B. C. conscience, which is the light of intelligence, to distinguish good and evil; humanity, which is the equity of the heart; moral courage, which is the force of the soul,—these are the three grand and universal moral faculties of the man." Surely Dr. Burns has heard of Socrates and Plato.

The rest of the discourse is excellent. It is difficult to select any particular portions as specimens of the power with which Dr. Burns manages his subjects, like Macaulay's ballads, they must be read entire to feel their full force,—yet we conclude with a brief sketch of Mormonism, which he introduces in his Religion of Credulity. "In 1805, a person of the name of Joseph Smith was born in the State of Vermont, America. His parents were worthless persons; his father was a profligate individual, and his mother was precisely of the same moral stamp. Their son was distinguished for idleness and dissipation. It was the great effort of the entire family to live without industrial labour, and Joseph commenced an early career of endeavouring to obtain a livelihood by digging for hidden treasures, which were supposed to have been concealed by parties during the wars in America. This occupation he pursued till 1822, and in that year he professed to have found a very precious stone, which enabled him to know distinctly where the hidden treasure was to be found; to discover which, he had previously employed so much time to no purpose. Having discovered this stone, he was in the habit of placing it in his hat, and looking at it, and saying, that it indicated to him certain signs by which he would certainly know where to obtain the long-sought treasure. The news of this marvellous stone spread rapidly around and excited the attention of the credulous.

In 1827, he professed that, guided by the lustre of the stone, he had discovered a most precious box which contained in it a quantity of golden plates. These he affirmed had come down from heaven; there they had been formed; there they had been cast, and from heaven they had been sent. This box he also asserted contained a new revelation, or rather an additional revelation of the word of God. These golden plates were not to supersede the Bible, but to give further views into it, open up its mysteries, and disclose the glories of the latter day dispensation."

Dr. Burns then shows the fraud that accompanied the publication of the Book of Mormon, and clearly exposes the falsehood of the whole system. We entreat our readers to inspect the little work for themselves.

---

*The Hymn Book.* Ward and Co., Paternoster-row.

In the present day, great exertions are being made to improve the psalmody of our churches. The book before us is a successful effort to help on this to be wished for consummation. One thing which has struck us in this Hymn Book, as being a great improvement, is the excellent arrangement of the subjects. By this, the indices are diminished in bulk, and a great deal of time is saved in selecting a hymn upon a given subject. But the great recommendation, is the beauty of the hymns here collected. All those verses, which in Watts mars some of the most beautiful hymns, are carefully weeded out. The Compiler has displayed great taste in this, as well as in his choice of hymns.

The book is well got up, and very cheap. The printing is clear and good. We most heartily recommend it to all pastors and Churches.

---











